

THE  
Anabaptist Teachers  
NO  
MINISTERS of CHRIST,  
Prov'd in a  
LETTER  
TO  
Mr. CHARSLEY  
AN  
Anabaptist Teacher at *Agmondesham*.  
And in a  
REPLY  
Made to Mr. *Stennet's*  
REMARKS  
Upon the aforefaid  
LETTER.

---

By *John Ball*, late of *St. Mary Hall, Oxon.*

---

London: Printed for *R. Burrough* at the *Sun* and  
*Moon* in *Cornhill*.



28



---

---

T H E  
P R E F A C E.

**A** Bout a Year and a Half since, I sent a Letter to Mr. Charfley, Teacher of the Anabaptists in Agmondesham: The Import of it was to disprove his Call to the Ministerial Function. And as I intended this for Good, so I was in hopes it might have had its desired Effect. But alas! I quickly found the contrary: For those of his Party, as well as him-

28

## The Preface.

himself, took great Offence at what was done, and instead of weighing impartially the Substance of the Discourse, traduc'd it one while, as being mere Calumny, or Reproach; another while 'twas pish't at as not deserving an Answer. But at length finding that it began to grow more publick, and that many Persons thought they either ought to satisfy the Objections, or recant the Errors which they were charg'd with; they laid out for some invincible Antagonist, and 'twas thought a few Stroaks of Mr. Stennett's Pen, would prove so very formidable, as to prevent a Rencounter,

## The Preface.

ter, and quickly cause such a poor Stripling as my self to quit the Field not without some Horror and Amazement.

Accordingly, at the beginning of January last, I receiv'd Remarks npon the Letter, by Mr. Stennett, which I look'd upon (after a due perusal) as not at all affecting the Substance of what I wrot. And therefore the Perswasion of others, together with my own Zeal and Concern for Truth, encourag'd me to give a Reply. Which swelling to a large Bulk, was too big for the private Transcriptions of Friends, and therefore has ventur'd out into the Publick. Mr.

## The Preface

*Mr. St. as you will find at the latter Part of his Remarks, was desirous that they should be communicated, and so I hope will not be offended at their being in print, which is the most expedient Way of Communication.*

*All that I Request more is, That the candid Reader would bring along with him a Mind quite estrang'd from Prejudice, or Interest. And make Allowance for the Roughness and Inelegance of the Stile, so he find Truth defended in the Reply.*

*March the 29th. 1708.*



(1)

---

A  
LETTER  
SENT TO

Mr. CHARLEY,  
Teacher of the *Anabaptists* in *Agmondesham*.

---

BY  
JOHN BALL Late of *St. Mary Hall, Oxon.*

---

Master Charley,

FOR so I must call you, not giving you the Title of reverend which perhaps you don't desire, neither do you deserve, except we allow you to be so upon the Score of Age and Gravity, and indeed upon this Account you may claim it, because we ought to \*rise up before the Hoary Head, and honour the Face of the old Man. But then this does not belong to you by Way of

B Pecu-

---

\* Levit. 19. 31. Prov. 16. 31.

2 *A Letter to Mr. Charlsley, &c.*

Peculiarity, and Supereminence, but is a Tribute due to all in general, as well as to your self in particular. The Aged Peasant requires it as well as the Aged Peer, and it belongs to the Old Smith as well as to the old \* Turner. Those Persons who authoritatively preside over others to instruct them in what they stand oblig'd towards God and towards Man, who shine with the Ornaments of Learning and Piety; who make it their chief End to promote Unity and Peace where they live, and run not to the Discharge of the sacerdotal Office before they are call'd, such Persons as these (I say) † *we are to esteem very highly in Love for their Works sake*; and honour them with Appellations which suit their Worth and Dignity. But here you come in for no share, you endeavour nothing of this: But on the contrary (so far as your small Talent will carry you) sow Feuds and Animosities amongst Christians, without any regard to Charity, || without which, you are no more than *sounding Brass, or a tinkling Cymbal*. So that I shall have no Occasion any further to dispute you out of this eminent Title, if I shall do these two things. First shew that you have no ordinary

---

\* Alluding to Mr. Charlsley's Trade. † *Thef.* 5. 13. || *1 Cor.* 13. 1.

*A Letter to Mr. Charlsley, &c.* 3

nary Vocation in the Ministry, and, secondly, that you have no extraordinary one.

First, I shall plainly prove, That you have no ordinary Vocation in the Ministry. Now it is universally agreed on, That the Authority of exercising the Ministry is virtually included in that Commission which our Saviour gave to his Apostles, \* *Go ye therefore and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: And lo I am with you always even unto the End of the World.* Now that the Authority of those who are to preach the Gospel is Virtually included in this Command, will appear from hence, that it is the plain reveal'd Will of our Lord in the Words before cited, that all Nations should be instructed in the Doctrine of Christianity, and made Members of his Church by Baptism. But if this Commission reach'd to none besides the Apostles themselves, it is evident that the Gospel could never extend it self over the whole World, and consequently the Design of our Saviour had been vacated, because the Conversion of it, was the thing which he intended. If then the Gospel was to be propagated

B 2

through-

---

\* Matt. 28, 19, 20.



#### 4 *A Letter to Mr. Charfley, &c.*

throughout the whole World, and the Apostles themselves could not totally discharge this Injunction, it was necessary that this Power should be inclusively given to other Persons, who might compleat that which was required in the Injunction, and which the Apostles themselves could by no Means effect, unless the Period of their Lives (common to the rest of Mankind) had been protracted coequal to all succeeding Ages. The Gospel then must be proclaim'd to the whole World, both to *Jews* and *Gentiles*. The Apostles receiv'd Authority to do it from Christ himself. It was impossible for them totally to effect what was required in this their Injunction. Other Persons therefore are virtually included in the Command which was given unto them, and also for the same End and Purpose. But here lies the Question, How must such Persons come by their Authority for this Performance? To this I answer categorically. This Power was transmitted from Christ to his Apostles: For to him was this Power first given, ἐδόθη μοι πᾶσα ἐξουσία, &c. *All \* Power, &c.* And then secondarily, conferr'd by the Apostles and alone by the Apostles, upon those whom they approv'd as worthy and capable to dis-

---

\* *Matt. 28. 18.*



*A Letter to Mr. Charfley, &c.* 5

discharge this Province. Now he who shall thrust himself into a Place of civil Judicature, and take upon him to pronounce the Sentence of Absolution and Condemnation, without being authoriz'd hereunto, can be look'd upon no better than a Murtherer. And therefore he must be highly criminal, who usurps the Exercise of the divine Function without any Shadow of Proof to warrant his Actions. The first of these robs Man of his Honour, but the last God. As every Man cannot be a Magistrate, nor ought to exercise this Power, unless invest'd with it by supream Authority: So no Man can be a priestly Minister, nor exercise this Power, unless invest'd with it by those who have Power and Authority to give it. \* *For if the whole Body were an Eye, where were the Hearing? If the whole were the Hearing, where were the Smelling? And if they were all one Member, where were the Body? So then there are diversities of Gifts, but the same Spirit. Are all Apostles? Are all Prophets? Are all Teachers? Are all workers of Miracles? By no Means, for if the whole Body were the Eye, where were the Hearing? From whence it is evident, that it behoves you, and all the rest of you (who are desirous to be*

B. 3

esteem'd

---

\* 1 Cor. 12. 17, &c.

6 *A Letter to Mr. Charley, &c.*

esteem'd regular Ministers of the Gospel) to produce ample Testimony, that you have receiv'd Authority for what you do, from those who had Power to conferr it upon you. Otherwise, every Man may take this Power upon him; and so the Body would become one Member, which indeed consists of many. Now it is manifest from the Text before cited, *Matt. 28. 18. That all Power was given unto Christ, as being Θεὸς καὶ ἄνθρωπος both God and Man.* So that no Body could claim this Power unless it was first given him by Christ himself, in whom it was originated. Nor after this were it possible to be invest'd with it, unless by those, who had been authoriz'd to conferr it upon others. For he who never had this Power given unto him, cannot conferr it. And in this Case the old philosophical Axiom holds true, *Nil dat, quod in se non habet*, Nothing can give you that which it self has not. So that if you have a Right of Administring the Word and Sacraments, you must prove your Mission from Apostolical Succession. But this I am sure you cannot do; and thus I prove it. They who have a Right of administring the Word and Sacraments from Apostolical Succession, must have a continu'd Succession of Ministry from the Apostles. But you have had no continu'd Succession of Ministry from the Apostles.

*A Letter to Mr. Charfley, &c.* 7

Apostles. Therefore you have no Right of adminiftring the Word and Sacraments from Apostolical Succellion. All that can be denied in this Syllogifm is the Affumption ; which is thus prov'd. Becaufe fo much as the very Name and Tenets of an Anabaptift was never heard of before the \*Middle of the third Century, and then they were condemn'd as Heretical by the general Suffrage of the Catholick Church. Moreover tho' thefe were *Anabaptifts* that rofe up fo early to the Difurbance of Chriftianity, yet they were not fuch as you are. For they receiv'd this Appellation for maintaining that thofe who were baptiz'd by Hereticks, were not effectually baptiz'd, but ought to receive a fecond Baptifm. But your Sect who deny that Infants have a Right to Baptifm, and confequently to the Covenant of Grace, had no Exiftence till about the Year 1524. in *Germany*, where the principal Leaders in this Faction play'd fuch Pranks, as you would be very unwilling to hear of. And this is a fhrewd Argument to prove you have no Church, becaufe Mushroom-like you fprung from the Earth in a Night's Space, and as foon difappear'd again. But the true Church held out againft the moft  
cruel



8 *A Letter to Mr. Charfley, &c.*

cruel and potent Malice of the Devil, and his Agents, when she was but in her Infancy. This she has done since, this she now does, and thus shall she maintain her Station till Time is no more. Because he who cannot lye, and who is able to perform his Promise has told us, *That the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against her.* But if still you will be laying hold on something to sustain your self, and keep your ordinary Vocation in the Ministry from sinking, you must no longer pretend to be authoriz'd from Apostolical Succession, but have Recourse to the Fag end, and bestow the Power of conferring Ordination upon the People. But here you will be at as great a Loss as you were before, because you cannot produce one Instance either from Scripture or Antiquity that will be serviceable to your Doctrine. You may indeed from Scripture track the Presence and Approbation of the People at Ordinations. But this is so far from proving that they had such a Power, that you may as well say, That I have Right to make a Justice of the Peace, Baronet, or a Peer of the Realm; because I stood by (at the Solemnity) and approv'd of those Persons, whom the supreme Power dignify'd with these Titles and Preferments. But I think I have sufficiently disprov'd your Ordinary, and therefore I shall proceed



*A Letter to Mr. Charfley, &c.* 9

proceed next to disprove your Extraordinary Vocation in the Ministry.

II. 'Tis scarce imaginable that any Men should have the Face to pretend to Immediate Inspiration at this time a Day. Because every Man may come to the Knowledge of his own Duty, if he will but give himself the Pains to turn over the Bible and Testament; or at most, if he will but vouchsafe to have Recourse to his spiritual Guides for better Information, when at any Time Doubts and Scruples perplex his Conscience; now it is manifest that you maintain this Doctrine of Immediate Inspiration, otherwise you could never be so sottish as to make choice of those for your Teachers who are Ignorant almost of their Primers, as you your self, and most of you are. And I am credibly inform'd that a mechanick Doctor, belongs to, and often preaches at this your Conventicle, who never arriv'd to the Knowledge of an A B C Darian. And therefore I wou'd fain understand how he should teach others, who cannot read one Syllable of the Scriptures, unless you think him immediately Inspir'd? For if he teaches not by immediate Inspiration, he must teach by Tradition. If you say the first, you speak Blasphemy, as shall by and by appear. If the latter, all such as rely upon his Doctrine,

C

lay

10 *A Letter to Mr. Charfley, &c.*

lay their Foundation in the Sand, and so does he himself that is thus unqualified. He that is an Hearer, and thus wretchedly Ignorant, may be excusable at last before God, if he has done his honest Endeavours toward the attaining a more thorough Inform'd Understanding. But he that is thus ignorant, and sets up to teach others will at last be found guilty of Nonsense as well as Presumption. If a Man (especially in these Times of Fluctuation) knows not how to make a strenuous and right Use of the Sword of the Spirit (which is the Word of God) He will hardly escape splitting upon the Rocks of heretical and schismatical Doctrines. And such blind Guides (like unskilful Pilots launching into the rough Ocean) carry all that depend upon their Conduct swiftly into the Abyss of Destruction. But that we may not deviate: If you pretend to immediate Inspiration, or new Revelations, you ought to give a certain Proof of it, before you Demand our Belief. For in this Case, 'tis not a mere say so, which a Man should rely upon. Produce your Credentials therefore; demonstrate by some infallible Tokens, that you are immediately sent from, and instructed by the Spirit of God. If you do not this, no Man in his right Senses can believe you? For there be other Sects  
that

*A Letter to Mr. Charsley, &c.* 11

that pretend to this as well as you, as the Quakers, Muggletonians, and other Enthusiasts, you cannot therefore be all inspired from God, because each of you contradicts the other: So that if you were all in the Right, the Spirit of God must be in the Wrong. Now the Apostles who were thus immediately influenc'd by the Spirit of God, did not only say they were inspir'd, but made it evident by Signs and Miracles; by healing the Sick, by restoring Sight to the Blind, and the Use of Limbs to the Lame and Impotent. And if you pretend to this extraordinary Mission, you must produce this extraordinary Proof of it. For an extraordinary Mission requires an extraordinary Power to confirm it. If you have not this extraordinary Power, you have no extraordinary Mission. If you have this extraordinary Power and shew it not (as you don't) you discharge not the Trust committed to you, and in so doing render your selves unfaithful Messengers of God. Because God gives nothing in Vain, and you make not that use of your Talent for the Reducing of us to the true Christian Faith, which you might do. But the chief of your Faction have not only pretended to this extraordinary Mission, but even to the Gift of foretelling future Events, as *Spittlehouse* and some others



12 *A Letter to Mr. Charfley, &c.*

did concerning the Sabbatical Millennium, or the time when Christ should Reign personally on Earth, and all the Kings of the Earth should receive their Downfall. But the time has long since pass'd away, which they prefix'd for the Accomplishment of these things, and nothing that was before told, is come about, so that if you will admit Scripture to be a Judge of our Actions, you will appear to all the World to be false Prophets, and consequently guilty of prodigious Blasphemy, *Deut.* 18. 20, 22. *The Prophet which shall presume to speak a Word in my Name, which I have not Commanded him to speak----- even that Prophet shall Die.* [So that by the Word of God, your Predecessors ought to have suffer'd Death, because they spoke in the Name of the Lord, that which he Commanded them not, otherwise what they had spoken would have come to pass.] *And if thou say in thine Heart, how shall we know the Word which the Lord hath not spoken? When a Prophet speaketh in the Name of the Lord, if the thing follow not nor come to pass; that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but the Prophet hath spoken it Presumptuously, thou shalt not be afraid of him.* You would do well to consider of these things. But here I shall lay down two more Criterions, by which



*A Letter to Mr. Charfley, &c.* 13

which false Prophets may be discover'd, The first is, that he who is immediately sent from God, must be a Man of Candour and Integrity. The second is, that neither must he speak contradictory to the reveal'd Will of God. Now to the first, It is well known what profligate Wretches the principal part of your Apostles were, witness *John* of *Leyden*, and his Colleagues, who ran naked about the Streets of the City, and Debauch'd Multitudes of simple Women. And as *John* Preach'd up the Community of Wives, so likewise he had no less than Fifteen to his own share. And therefore, altho' you are so mightily attentive to the Dictates of the Spirit; yet, like other People, (sometimes) you have a little hankering after the Flesh. But I will not dwell any longer upon this Topick, because it may (perhaps) make you blush, and offend others who are better pleas'd with Argument, than Upbraiding. Therefore to the second, It is plain you Preach up Doctrine that is contrary to the Word of God, as the Disobedience to, and Extirpation of Kings: *Whereas the very Angels themselves dare not bring a railing Accusation against them before the Lord, 2 P. 10. 11.* You dissolve all the Frame and untie all the Sinews of Government, by asserting, That none ought to be greater than another, and that Christians

14 *A Letter to Mr. Charfley, &c.*

ought to enjoy all things in Common. You are guilty of Heresie and Schism; of Railing and Backbiting, and Evil Surmises, and speak Evil of the things which you understand not, all which are numbred among the Works of Darknes. But these are sufficient to prove that you are not immediately inspir'd, and consequently, that you have no extraordinary Mission. *Quod erat demonstrandum.*

Now that we may conclude this Discourse, it is plain from what has been said, that you have neither an Ordinary nor Extraordinary Vocation in the Ministry, and so no Warrant nor Authority for what you do. And therefore at present I shall do no more but advise you to consider seriously of your Actions, and of what St. Jude saith in his general Epistle, *ver. 11. Wo unto them; for they have gone in the way of Cain, and ran greedily after the Errour of Balaam for Reward, and Perish'd in the Gainsaying of Korah.*

FAREWELL.

RE-

---

# REMARKS

UPON THE

# LETTER

SENT TO

Mr. *CHARSLEY*,

Teacher of the *Anabaptists* in *Agmondesham*.

---

BY

Mr. *JOSEPH STENNET*.

---

SIR,

**S**INCE you have been pleas'd to  
desire my Thoughts on Mr. *Ball's*  
Letter to Mr. *Charsley*, which you  
lately communicated to me, I am  
not willing to deny you, especially  
since I am inform'd that the Author of that  
Letter and his Admirers, make it a mighty  
Occasion



Occasion of Triumph, that no Person has yet thought meet to answer it, and therefore conclude it unanswerable, whereas they ought to consider, that 'tis possible for a Writer to owe his Security from Animadversions to the meanness of his Performance, rather than to the Strength of his Arguments. Whether Mr. C'—s Antagonist is so formidable a Champion, as some of his Friends seem by their Boasting, to imagine, will soon appear to any one, who shall impartially Examine his Letter and the following Reflections upon it.

I confess the first Paragraph of that Letter has somewhat in it so odd and uncommon that we shall seldom meet with the like, and therefore I shall transcribe it Verbatim before I make my Remarks upon it.

*Master Charley,*

‘ **F**OR so I must call you, not giving  
 ‘ you the Title of reverend which  
 ‘ perhaps you don’t desire, neither do you  
 ‘ deserve, except we allow you to be so up-  
 ‘ on the Score of Age and Gravity; and in-  
 ‘ deed upon this Account you may claim  
 ‘ it, because we ought to \* *rise up before*  
 ‘ *the Hoary Head, and honour the Face of the*  
 ‘ *old*

---

\* Levit. 19. 11. Prov. 16. 31.

*Letter sent to Mr. Charfley: 17*

*old Man.* But then this does not belong  
to you by Way of Peculiarity, and Su-  
pereminence, but is a Tribute due to all  
in general, as well as to your self in parti-  
cular. The Aged Peasant requires it as well  
as the Aged Peer, and it belongs to the Old  
Smith as well as to the old Turner.  
Those Persons who authoritatively preside  
over others to instruct them in what they  
stand oblig'd towards God and towards  
Man, who shine with the Ornaments of  
Learning and Piety; who make it their  
chief End to promote Unity and Peace  
where they live, and run not to the Dis-  
charge of the sacerdotal Office before  
they are call'd, such Persons as these (I say)  
† *we are to esteem very highly in Love for  
their Works sake;* and honour them with  
Appellations which suit their Worth and  
Dignity. But here you come in for no share,  
you endeavour nothing of this: But on the  
contrary (so far as your small Talent will  
carry you) sow Feuds and Animosities a-  
mongst Christians, without any regard to  
Charity, || without which, you are no  
more than *sounding Brass, or a tinkling  
Cymbal.* So that I shall have no Occasion  
any further to dispute you out of this  
eminent Title, if I shall do these two  
D things.

18 . *Remarks upon Mr. Ball's*

'things. First shew that you have no ordinary Vocation in the Ministry, and, secondly, that you have no extraordinary one.

§. 1. By the latter part of this Paragraph it appears, that Mr. B——'s design in Writing this Letter, was to dispute Mr. C. out of the eminent Title of Reverend, by shewing, *First*, That he had no ordinary Vocation in the Ministry, and *2dly*, That he had no extraordinary one; for he says, he should have no Occasion any further to dispute him out of this eminent Title, if he shou'd do these two things: The Design (I say) of this whole Letter, is to tell Mr. C. why he does not call him Reverend at the beginning of it. Now I would fain know what reason he had to give him any Title at all in a Letter, when he had no Occasion to Write, for if Mr. B. had any thing to Write upon to Mr. C. why does he make the Title of Mr. C. the Argument of his Letter? If he had nothing to Write to him about, what need was there of a Letter? If he meant to talk of Mr. C——'s Title only by the bye how came he to forget himself, so as to make this the whole Design of his Letter? For 'tis all acknowledg'd to be written for this one End, *viz.* To dispute him out of this eminent Title. Those who are acquainted with Mr. C. know he has too much Sense and Humility



*Letter sent to Mr. Charlsley.* 19

mility to contend for the Title of Reverend. And, yet Mr. B. and his Partizans, seem to wonder that he does not Answer what it becomes him to Despise, and if Mr. B. should Write never so many Epistles to shew Cause why he will not give Mr. C. the Title of Reverend; I think Mr. C. wou'd be in the right to be Silent, for 'tis scarce worth while to answer the Learned Reasons of Mr. B. against his giving him this Epithet. A Man must have a mighty itch of Disputing, who rather than not have the Pleasure of Quarreling, will spin a Controversie out of his own Bowels; and rather than not Write a Contentious Letter, will raise a Dispute on the first Word himself Writes, and make it the Occasion of the whole Epistle.

§. 2. Did Mr. B. think it a difficult Matter to justify himself for omitting to give this Character to Mr. C. or not? If he did, what need had he to bring all this trouble upon himself without any Occasion given? If he did not, why does he take up the whole Letter in Justifying this Omission? And since he thought meet to omit this term, why did he not quietly pass on, if he had any thing else to say to Mr. C. instead of Stopping short after he had call'd him by his Name, and making a Parenthesis of six or seven long Lines, without any colour of Reason, unless it be that of having the Satisfaction

20 *Remarks upon Mr. Ball's*

of telling Mr. C. that he deserves not the Title of Reverend?

§. 3. And after all Mr. B. owns that Mr. C. deserves this Title on the Score of Age and Gravity; and if there be this good Reason to allow it him, why should a long Letter be written to shew the Reason why he denies it him? For if 'tis fit to give it him on one Account (as Mr. B. allows, and cites a Passage of Holy Scripture to prove it) why should it be absolutely refus'd him? Unless Mr. B. thinks it just to refuse him that which he owns 'tis reasonable on one good Account to allow him. And with what Conscience can Mr. B. after having declar'd from *Levit. 19. 31.* that we ought to *Rise up before the Hoary Head, and honour the Face of the old Man*, in the very same Breath call him in Contempt the *Old Turner*, and compare him with the *Old Smith*; it will not serve Mr. B's Turn after this, to tell Mr. C. that the Title of Reverend belongs not to him by way of Peculiarity and Supereminence, but is a Tribute due to all in general, that is to all who are Old, as he immediately explains himself. 'The Aged Peasant (says he) requires it as well as the Aged Peer, and it belongs to the Old Smith as well as the Old Turner; for if he would not give it him as deserving it by Way of Peculiarity and Supereminence (as he is pleas'd

*Letter sent to Mr. Charfley.* 21

pleas'd to phrase it) he might have allow'd it him on the Score on which the Scripture requires it, or at least have forbore the Rudeness of ridiculing him under the Title of the Old Turner, in a Letter that confesses that according to the Scripture he ought to be reverenc'd. Does Mr. B. delight to contradict himself, or is he so transported with the Wit he uses in ridiculing his Neighbour, that he forgets to employ that good Sense which is necessary to keep himself from being ridiculous?

§. 4. But if the Title of Reverend does not belong to Mr. C. because 'tis a Tribute due to all Old Men in general as Mr. B. argues, then it will follow that the Title of Reverend does not belong to any one of those Ministers, whom Mr. B. calls Ornaments of Learning and Piety, by way of Peculiarity and Supereminence, because 'tis due upon his Account, to all Ministers who are Ornaments of Learning and Piety in general.

Tho' by the Way, if he should restrain this Title to those of this Character, such Ministers whose intellectual or moral Endowments have not yet made 'em pass for Ornaments of Piety and Learning, must all be depriv'd of the Title of Reverend, and 'tis to be fear'd this wou'd prove a common Case in some Parts of the World.



22      *Remarks upon Mr. Ball's*

Yet I doubt Mr. B. himself would hardly scruple in writing to a Clergy-Man, to give him the Title of Reverend, tho' he were not arriv'd to that Degree of Knowledge and Virtue, that such whom he is pleas'd to call Ornaments of Piety and Learning have attain'd. In the mean time he is very fearful lest Mr. C. should be thought to deserve that Title, tho' his long and attentive Study of the Scripture, has given him perhaps as much Knowledge of the Sense of it as some of those learned Gentlemen have, who despise him for his want of Learning; which is abundantly compensated however by his exemplary Piety and Virtue, and these will always make him reverenc'd in the Minds of those who have Sense and Justice enough to esteem Holiness and Purity above all the School Learning in the World.

§. 5. And it had been more for Mr. B——'s Honour if with his Learning he had shewn a little more Temper and Charity than he does when he reproaches this venerable old Man, with 'sowing Feuds and Animosities among Christians, without any regard to Charity, and so making him 'no more than *sounding Brass, or a tinkling Cymbal*. Does he sufficiently know Mr. C——'s Heart to make this Judgment of him, that he has no Regard to Charity?

Have

*Letter sent to Mr. Charfley.* 23

Have Mr. C——'s Neighbours found him so contentious as this Gentleman represents? His Conversation in the Place where he lives had given him quite another Character till this Gentleman discover'd the Feuds and Animosities he had sown. However the good People of *Agmondesham* must judge for themselves, and if there are now any Feuds and Animosities among 'em on the Account of Religion, I suppose they know to whom to ascribe 'em.

§. 6. But 'tis time for me to have done with this Part of Mr. B——'s Letter, which I should not have dwelt on so long, if Mr. B. had not insulted Mr. C. with an Incivility equal to his Absurdity, and offended good Manners as much as he has done good Sense.

I shall now consider the two things, by which Mr. B. pretends to prove that Mr. C. deserves not to be call'd Reverend, first, says he, 'I'll shew that you have no ordinary Vocation in the Ministry, secondly 'that you have no extraordinary one.

§. 7. To prove that Mr. C. has no ordinary Vocation in the Ministry (as he is pleas'd to express it) he endeavours to shew that Christ in his Commission *Matt. 28. 19, 20. Go ye therefore and teach all Nations baptizing them, &c.* respects not only the Apostles to whom it was immediately given,

given, but all the true Ministers to the End of the World, which I presume Mr. C. would have readily granted, without putting him to the trouble of formally proving it; he then states this Question, How must such Persons come by their Authority? To which (he says) he answers Categorically, 'that this Power was transmitted from Christ to his Apostles, and alone by the Apostles on those whom they approv'd as Worthy and Capable of Discharging this Province. This he confirms by *Matt. 28. 18. All Power is given to me in Heaven, &c.* which he first quotes in *Greek*, not that he has any Remark to make on the Original Text, to Elucidate the English Translation, but because he thinks it very edifying to adorn his Letter with a little *Greek*, as he does afterwards with a Scrap or two of *Latin*, his philosophical Axioms, and his Syllogisms, when he writes to one who is almost ignorant of his Primer, as he in his Letter is pleas'd to say of Mr. C. If he thinks Mr. C. understands these learned Languages and Sciences, why does he say he is almost ignorant of his Primer; If he believes he does not understand them, to what purpose does he use all this Learning in a Letter to an illiterate Man?

§. 8. But to return to his Argument; he brings the Matter to this Result that, if  
Mr.



*Letter sent to Mr. Charfley.* 25

Mr. C. has a Right of administering the Word and Sacraments, he must prove his Mission from Apostolical Succession or a continu'd Succession of Ministry from the Apostles, and concludes that Mr. C. has had no continu'd Succession of Ministry from the Apostles and therefore he has no Right of administering, &c.

§. 9. But Mr. B. is not aware that if this Argument proves any thing, it proves too much, and will shake the Authority of the Ministers of the Church of *England*, and indeed of all other Churches as well as that of Mr. C. For I desire Mr. B. would produce one Minister who is able clearly to prove the successive Derivation of his Ministry from Hand to Hand without Interruption from the Apostles. What Minister who is ordain'd can be certain that the Person who ordains him has by an uninterrupted Succession deriv'd his Authority from the Apostles? and how can the People be satisfied that they have any lawful Ministry at all; unless they could know that the Line of their Succession has never been broken since the Apostolick Times; which is impossible for them to know without examining the History of the Church for above 1600 Years; nor indeed if they were capable of such an Examination could they arrive at a Certainty in this Matter, because some Records

E

that

that are necessary to this Purpose are lost, and others that are extant contradict each other; some have the Characters of a spurious Original, some have been interpolated, and most of 'em leave us under great Uncertainty, especially in such Particularities as these; so that the greatest Criticks wou'd find insuperable Difficulties in such a Research: It must needs therefore be a Work utterly impracticable by the common People, and yet according to Mr. B. no Ministers Authority can be prov'd without it. If he is himself in Orders I should be glad to see him prove his Authority by an uninterrupted Succession from the Apostles: Or else for want of this Proof he may, according to his own Account, be 'look'd upon no better than a Murtherer, 'must be highly criminal for robbing God 'of his Honour; for these are the severe Terms which Mr. B. uses on this Occasion, that he may vent his Anger against Mr. C. not considering that his Hypothesis involves the Ministers of his own Church in the same Guilt, and makes them worse than Murtherers, &c. unless they can prove their Succession in an uninterrupted Line from the Apostles.

§. 10. Nor is this Gentleman better founded in what he says afterwards, namely that Mr. C. can't have such a Succession because 'the Names and Tenets of the  
*'Ana-*

Letter sent to Mr. Charisley. 27

*Anabaptists* were not heard of till the Middle of the third Century: For suppose an *Anabaptist* was not heard of till that Time, that does not hinder but the first *Anabaptist* Minister might derive his Ministry from the Apostles as well as others, and might transmit it by Succession down to future Ages as well as they; if he urge that the Ministry so transmitted would cease to be lawful, when deriv'd from the Hand of an *Anabaptist* he ought to prove it: If he pretends *Anabaptism* is Heresies and therefore deprives him that holds it of his Ministerial Authority *ipso facto*; then who knows how many of the Church of *England* and other Churches have deriv'd Orders immediately from Hereticks, or from those who have receiv'd Orders from Hereticks in some Age or other since the Apostles? And how can any Man that is ordain'd, be sure that he that ordains him is not an Heretick, unless he were capable of perfectly knowing his Heart, which is the incommunicable Prerogative of the Almighty? And seeing the Ministers of the Church of *England* deriv'd their Orders before the Reformation from the Church of *Rome*, their Orders must be void if the *Romish* Bishops were guilty of Heresie, as I believe 'tis no hard matter to prove they were; and of Idolatry too which is as bad;



I am sure there Errors were much worse than what is call'd *Anabaptism* (supposing that were an Error;) and at this rate what will become of Mr. B——'s fine Discourse of a ministerial Succession without Interruption? And into what a Labyrinth has his Way of reasoning fix'd him. I should think therefore those who are competently qualified for the ministerial Office, and are regularly chosen by the People over whom they are to preside, and then ordain'd by the Imposition of the Hand of such Elders or Ministers as were allow'd to be invested with that Office before 'em, may be satisfied with their Call to the Ministry, and the People under their Charge satisfied with their Administration without attempting to trace a Succession without any Flaw from the Apostolick Times.

§. 11. But all this while I can by no means grant that the *Anabaptists* (as Mr. B. is pleas'd to call 'em) are of so late a Date as he pretends; as for those he mentions in the third Century he acknowledges them to be so call'd because they were for rebaptizing those that were baptiz'd by Hereticks, for which he says they were condemn'd as heretical by the Church, and that these are not such as Mr. C. But, says he, 'the Sect who deny that Infants have 'a Right to Baptism, &c. had no Existence  
'till

‘till about the Year 1524. in *Germany*, where  
‘the principal Leaders in this Faction play’d  
‘such Pranks, as you would be very un-  
‘willing to hear of. And this is a very  
‘shrewd Argument to prove you have no  
‘Church, because Mushroom-like you sprung  
‘from the Earth in a Night’s Space, and  
‘as soon disappear’d again, &c.

Whether Mr. C. and those of his profes-  
sion are in the Right to deny Baptism to  
Infants will best appear by the Reasons  
some of them have publish’d to the World  
against this Practice of Infant Baptism. If  
M. B. will answer their Difficulties, and  
shew ’em a divine Precept for Infant Bap-  
tism, they will be very much oblig’d to  
him. But he betrays his great Ignorance  
of Ecclesiastick History in pretending that  
those who denied Infant Baptism had no  
Being till the Year 1524. for ’tis evident  
many of the Antient *Vaudois* and *Albigensis*,  
divers Ages before the Time this Gentle-  
man speaks of, were against Infant Bap-  
tism, as I have clearly prov’d in my An-  
swer to *Russen* Pag. 81, 82, 83, 84. and  
*Tertullian* who liv’d in the second Centu-  
ry speaks exprelly against Infant Baptism,  
whose Words I have cited in the 69th  
page of the Book abovemention’d.

§. 12. Nay, unless Mr. B. can prove In-  
fant Baptism to have been the Apostolick

30 *Remarks upon Mr. Ball's*

Practice, he'll find it of later Date than the Opinion of those whom he calls *Anabaptists*; For 'tis certain that the Practice of baptizing adult Persons is Apostolical and has a divine Institution; but I presume he will find it difficult to produce one Proof that Infant Baptism was practis'd in the Christian Church till near 200 Years after the Birth of Christ.

§. 13. Again what can be the Meaning of the pleasant Turn he gives this Matter in saying to Mr. C. 'You Mushroom-like sprung from the Earth in a Night's Space, and as soon disappear'd again; for if Mr. C. and those of his Opinion sprung up as suddenly and as lately as he pretends, yet 'tis certain they have not disappear'd again, nay they appear to be abundantly increas'd since the time he speaks of. Now to make any tolerable Sense of this Passage seems very difficult. If the *Anabaptists* are all vanish'd, what need had this Gentleman to trouble his Head about them and their Ministry? If they still appear in the World and their Number is much increas'd since the Time he mentions, why does he affirm that they soon disappear'd again after they sprung up? So that his Inference is ill founded, that the *Anabaptists* can't be of the true Church of Christ against whom he promis'd the Gates of Hell should not prevail



*Letter sent to Mr. Charlsley.* 31

prevail because of their sudden disappearing in the World, since they still subsist, and are likely so to do unless convinc'd or confuted by better Arguments than those he is pleas'd to produce against 'em.

§. 14. As to the Pranks some German *Anabaptists* play'd, and which he says Mr. C. would be unwilling to hear of, they are no worse than have been often play'd by the *Pedo-Baptists* of different Nations, and it would be easie to recriminate particularly if it were necessary. If you please, Sir, to lend Mr. B. my Answer to Mr. *Russen*, he will find by reading the 11th Chapter of that Book, that he has no Reason to charge on the *Anabaptists* in *England* the mad Pranks of some Enthusiastick People of diverse Opinions in *Germany*.

§. 15. Mr. B. Concludes this Head in insulting Mr. C. after the following Manner. 'But (says he) if still you will be laying 'hold on something to sustain your self, and 'keep your ordinary Vocation in the Ministry from sinking, you must no longer pretend to be authoriz'd by Apostolical 'Succession, but have Recourse to the Fag 'end, and bestow the Power of conferring 'Ordination on the People. But here you 'will be at as great a Loss as you were before, because you cannot produce one In-

## 32 *Remarks upon Mr. Ball's*

' stance either from Scripture or Antiquity  
 ' that will be serviceable to your Doctrine.  
 ' You may indeed from Scripture track the  
 ' Presence and Approbation of the People at  
 ' Ordinations. But this is so far from pro-  
 ' ving that they had such a Power, that  
 ' you may as well say, That I have Right  
 ' to make a Justice of the Peace, a Baronet, or  
 ' a Peer of the Realm; because I stood by  
 ' (at the Solemnity) and approv'd of those  
 ' Persons, whom the supreme Power digni-  
 ' fy'd with these Titles and Preferments, &c.

§. 16. But I have shown already, that  
 there is no need for Mr. C. to bestow the Po-  
 wer of Ordination upon the People, as Mr.  
 B. expresses it, seeing there may be good and  
 regular Ordination by the hands of Ministers,  
 according to the Divine Rule, without the  
 Necessity of proving an uninterrupted Succes-  
 sion of Ordination from the Apostles, and tho'  
 the People can't ordain they have a right to  
 choose Officers in the Church, as is Evident  
 from their choice of Deacons, *Acts* 6. 5. and  
 from the choice of Persons to Travel with  
 the Apostles, *2 Cor.* 8. 19. in both which  
 places, the *Greek* Word signifies a Choice  
 by holding up the Hands, which signifies  
 more than the bare Presence or Approbation  
 as Mr. B. Suggests, when he wou'd have  
 Mr. C. think that the choice of the People  
 mention'd in Scripture, signifies no more  
 right

right of Election 'than he has to make a  
' Justice of the Peace, a Baronet, or a Peer  
' of the Realm, because he stands by at the  
' Solemnity, and approves of those Persons  
' whom the Supreme Power dignifies with  
' these Titles and Preferments.

§. 17. Mr. B. now dismisses the first and main Point he undertook, which was to disprove Mr. C——'s ordinary Call to the Ministry; this he presumes is sufficiently done, and therefore proceeds to disprove his extraordinary Vocation.

§. 18. And here he presumes that Mr. C. and those with him pretend to 'immediate  
' Inspiration, or else they wou'd not pretend,  
' considering their want of Learning, to  
' Preach to the People. I must observe to this Gentleman, that it does not follow, that because a Man who wants human Learning Preaches, that therefore he pretends to immediate Inspiration. For Mr. B. for instance may instruct the People in what he knows, by reading the Scripture, meditating on it, and making use of various Annotations and other Writings to explain it that are Extant in the English Tongue, without leading them swiftly into Destruction, as he uncharitably represents, and without any pretence to immediate Revelation. Nay, a Man of good Sense, with such helps as I have mention'd, and the Application of his Mind to  
the



# 34 *Remarks upon Mr. Ball's*

the Study of the Scripture, (especially if his Conversation be Exemplary) may be much more capable of Edifying his Neighbours, than a Man of more Learning, who has less Sense, and improves not the Talent he has, in applying himself to that strict Study of the Word of God, nor Exemplifies the Doctrine of Christ in the Conduct of his Life. And if at the beginning of the Reformation in *England*, none but Men of Learning had been allow'd to Preach, few Parishes had been supplied with Ministers, nor wou'd there have been a Necessity to Compose for them a Book of Homilies, to read to the People, because few of them knew how to Preach. Sure Mr. B. will hardly Censure those unlearn'd Ministers, or such as now want Learning in the Church of *England*, 'as carrying all that depend upon their Conduct, swiftly to the Abyss of Destruction. For 'tis no hard matter to find Clergy-men in the Church of *England*, who have a very poor Stock of Learning. I confess it were to be wish'd, that the Ministers of all Churches had much more Learning than they generally are possess'd of. In the mean time, it wou'd more become Mr. B. to improve what Learning he has, than to despise his Neighbours, for having wanted a liberal Education, tho' they have the better Qualities of Piety and Charity, and on that Account,

count, are very Worthy of his Imitation.

§. 19. But when Mr. B. affirms that Mr. C. and most of the Teachers of the *Anabaptists* are almost Ignorant of their Primer, he would certainly be thought to know them very well; ~~else~~ how could he take so exact a measure of their Knowledge. And yet the Judgment he makes is a plain Proof that he is unacquainted with them, since they are far from being so despicably Ignorant as he pretends. There is no party of Christians but have some ignorant People among them, who are unreasonably Conceited of their Abilities to instruct others, but if the Folly of some should be imputed to all, all Parties wou'd on this Account be liable to equal Censure.

§. 20. Mr. B. might have spar'd the pains he takes in proving that Mr. C. and the rest of the *Anabaptists* are not immediately Inspir'd, till they pretend to an extraordinary Mission: For they will readily grant that such a Mission is not to be allow'd without the extraordinary Proof he mentions. And as to what he says concerning the pretence of the chief of Mr. C——'s Faction (that is suppose of the *Anabaptists*) to this extraordinary Mission, 'tis boldly asserted, but he is not pleas'd to attempt the Proof of it, no doubt for a very good Reason. What he says of *Spittlehouse*, and of some others  
(whose

## 36 *Remarks upon Mr. Ball's*

(whose Names he thinks not fit to mention) who he tells us were mistaken in their Predictions about the Millennium, will by no means prove that the chief of the *Anabaptists* pretend to immediate Inspiration and an extraordinary Mission, any more than the false Predictions of the late Mr. *Mason* of *Northamptonshire*, about the coming of Christ and the Millennium, and the Whimfies of other *Enthusiasts* of the Church of *England*, prove that the chief of that Party pretend to immediate Inspiration, &c. For Mr. B. can't make appear, that Mr. *Spittlehouse* and those other nameless Persons to whom he refers, were the chief of the *Anabaptists*.

§. 21. When he says the Predecessors of the *Anabaptists* ought to have suffer'd Death, he but too plainly intimates what Treatment he would give their Successors, if it were in his Power. But (thanks be to God) our Governours have more Wisdom and Charity, than to persecute the poor *Anabaptists* for Conscience sake, however the Effusion of their Blood might gratify some Men.

§. 22. What he says of *John* of *Leyden* and his Colleagues, affects the *Anabaptists* no more than the *Enthusiasm* and Wickedness, some of those of the Church Mr. B. belongs to have been guilty of, concerns that whole Body.



37 Letter sent to Mr. Charsley. 38

§. 23. But least the Charge of false Prophecy and Blasphemy, shou'd not render the *Anabaptists* infamous enough, and make some of them at least thought worthy of Captial Punishment, Mr. B. is pleas'd to Charge them with Treason, for I suppose 'tis not meerly Mr. C. but the *Anabaptists* in general that he attacks in the following Terms, viz. 'It is plain you Preach up 'Doctrine that is contrary to the Word of 'God, as the Disobedience to, and Extirpation of Kings, &c.

§. 24. One wou'd think by this Account, that the *British* Government were in great Danger by the *Anabaptists*, and that there were a great number of Nonjurors among them, whereas I believe 'twill be hard for Mr. B. to find one of that Character in the whole Party, while he knows, there are many of the Church of *England*, who refuse to swear to the present Government. So that if we may judge of Mens Principles by their Practices, there is a considerable Number of the Church Mr. B. relates to, who are ill Affected to the present Government, while Mr. B. can find no disaffected Party, nor perhaps one disloyal Person among the *Anabaptists*. Let any one judge then, what Justice there appears in this Man's Accusations. 'Tis no hard matter to guess what Punishment this Gentleman wou'd

38 *Remarks upon Mr. Ball's*

wou'd award to those whom he accuses of such Crimes as these, besides the leveling Principle of asserting, 'that none ought to be greater than other, and that Christians ought to enjoy all things in Common; of Railing and Backbiting, and of Evil Surmises, and of speaking Evil of things which they understand not at all, which (he says) are numbred among the Works of Darkness. But 'tis certain, this Accusation will deserve to be numbred among the Works of Darkness too, till the Truth of it be set in a clear Light. And as Mr. B. concludes in recommending to Mr. C. and other *Anabaptists*, the serious Consideration of the 11th verse of the Epistle of Jude, *Wo unto them, for they have gone in the way of Cain, and run greedily after the Error of Balaam for Reward, and. Perish'd in the Gain-saying of Corah*; so I wish he had Explain'd his meaning: Do the *Anabaptists* go in the way of Cain, by Envy-ing and Persecuting their Brethren, because more Righteous than themselves? Do they run greedily after the Error of *Balaam* for Reward, in tempting others to Lewdness and Idolatry? Or do they presumptuously oppose divine Revelation, like those that perish'd in the gain-saying of *Core*? 'Tis strange that Mr. B. should give himself the Liberty of Censuring Innocent Men in a Manner so gross, and without any Proof

or

*Letter sent to Mr. Charsley.* 39

or tolerable Appearance of Reason. Mr. B. would do well to beware lest himself fall under the Guilt of any of those Crimes with which he so liberally bespatters his Neighbours. The Spirit of Persecution he breaths in this Letter, seems too much to resemble the Temper of *Cain*, and calls for Mr B——'s serious Consideration and Repentance.

§. 25. It were easie, Sir, to add to these Reflections many others that would not be impertinent, but I think I have sufficiently insisted on the most material things in Mr. B——'s Letter. I give you leave to communicate this to whom you think fit, but in a particular Manner I desire Mr. B. may see it, in hopes it may disengage him from his Prejudices, and induce him to think more humbly of himself, and more charitably of his honest Neighbours and other innocent People whom he has egregiously abus'd. I conclude in offering my hearty Prayers to Almighty God to make him sensible of his Error and of his unaccountable Fury ; to pardon his Rashness, and want of Charity ; and to give him a better Temper of Mind. I am

S I R,

*Your very humble Servant,*

Jos. Stennett.



---

A  
R E P L Y  
T O

Mr. *Stennett's* REMARKS  
UPON THE  
LETTER to Mr. *CHARSLET*,  
Teacher of the *Anabaptists* in *Agmondesham*.

---

B Y  
*JOHN BALL* Late of *St. Mary Hall, Oxon.*

---

*Ad. §. 1.* **M**R. *Stennet* (after some  
Flourishes to the  
Gentleman he was  
writing to) begins  
at my first Para-  
graph, and because he found therein some-  
what odd and uncommon, transcribes it  
*verbatim*

*verbatim*, that you may the better observe where it lies. And then after mature Deliberation, finds that my 'Design in writing the Letter was to dispute Mr. C. out of the eminent Title of Reverend, which I grant him, not thinking that I have committed any Absurdity in so doing. For in the first Place, I allow him the Title of Reverend upon a civil Account, when I give 'it him upon the Score of Age and Gravity; but in the second Place deny it him upon the Ecclesiastical Account, because it belongs to those Persons that are legally enstated in the Ministry, in a peculiar and supereminent manner, as being \* taken from among Men, and ordain'd for Men in things pertaining to God, that they may offer both Gifts and Sacrifices for Sins. And now where was the Impropriety in making it the Design of my Letter to dispute Mr. C. out of the eminent Title of Reverend? † There ought to be no wonder why Men contend for Titles, because to deny 'em these, sometimes is to deny the Rank, Station or Office in which they are, or pretend to be plac'd. And this is the Case with Mr. C.

F

for

---

\* *Hebr. 5. ver. 1.* † *Inde non est prorsus de nihilo, quod interdum magno ardore super titulis inter Homines pugnatur; ideo quod Titulo denegato, denegari quoque alicui intelligantur Status, Munus, Potestas atq; Jura, quæ iste titulus exprimere aut innuere solet. Sam. Pufend. lib. 1. cap. 1. Sec. 18.*

for I deny him this Title upon an Ecclesiastical Account, which is the very same as to deny him to be a Minister; and by proving that he had neither an ordinary or an Extraordinary Vocation in the Ministry, I shew'd that he could not lay any Claim to this Title eminently in an Ecclesiastical Sense, or that he and the rest of his Partizans were no true Ministers: This might serve as an Answer to all his Quibbles upon this Point, but however I shall proceed.

*Ad §. 2.* Mr. St. in the next place asks these Questions, *viz.* 'Did Mr. B. think it a difficult matter to Justify himself for omitting to give this Character to Mr. C. or not? If he did, what need had he to bring all this Trouble upon himself without any Occasion given? If he did not, why does he take up the whole Letter in justifying this Omission? To deal plainly, I did not only think it a difficult Matter to give Mr. C. this Character, but impossible, *salva Conscientia*, to give it him in that Sense which I confin'd it to, *i.e.* an Ecclesiastical one. To have done this, had been to call the Laick a Divine, and to have reverenc'd him in that for which he ought to be despis'd. Besides, to take up the whole Letter in justifying this Omission was requisite, because by disputing him out of this Eminent Title in an Ecclesiastical



cal Sense, I at the same time disputed him out of all Claim to the Sacerdotal Office, which was what I propos'd to do, by shewing he had neither an ordinary or extraordinary Vocation in the Ministry.

*Ad §. 3.* In the next Paragraph Mr. St. concludes that I have contradicted my self in what I spoke of this Title of Reverend, and being transported with the Wit of Ridiculing my Neighbour, I have not employ'd that good Sense which is necessary to keep my self from being Ridiculous. But this is meer Noise. For how have I contradicted, or made my self ridiculous? Is it a Contradiction to allow a Man a Title in one Sense, and to refuse it him in another? Must I appear ridiculous because other Persons make themselves so? The Distinction of a civil and ecclesiastical Reverence was observ'd throughout the Paragraph without the least confusion, so that *Qui capit, ipse facit*, if there be any Contradiction Mr. St. himself is the Author of it. For he says in the very next Words, 'After all Mr. B. owns that Mr. C. deserves this Title upon the Score of Age and gravity, and if there be this good Reason to allow it him, why should a long Letter be written to shew the Reason why he denies it him? I do indeed allow this Title to Mr. C. upon the Score of Age and

F 2

Gravity,

Gravity, but deny it him upon another Account, and therefore it was convenient I should give a Reason, why I did so, and make this the Design of my long Letter; for by shewing that Mr. C. cou'd lay no claim to the Title of Reverend in an Ecclesiastical Sense, I at the same time prov'd, that he could lay no claim to the Ministry. And therefore seeing I did allow this Title to Mr. C. upon a civil Account, why does he in the next Words insinuate that I absolutely refus'd it him? If this be not a Contradiction to say I gave Mr. C. this Title on one Account, and at the same time to say I absolutely refus'd it him, what is?

But I must by all Means have made Shipwrack of my Conscience, because 'after 'having declar'd from \* *Levit. That we 'ought to rise up before the hoary Head, and 'honour the Face of the old Man*, I in the 'very same Breath call him in Contempt 'the old Turner, and compare him with 'the old Smith. If the Calling of a Turner or that of a Smith be so contemptible as not to be worth mentioning, I advise all the Party not to make choice of those for their Teachers, that have any thing to do with the Lare or Hammer. If they be not, I see not any Contempt express'd

---

\* *Levit. 19. 31.*

express'd in calling Men by the Name of their Professions.

*Ad* §. 4. It will be somewhat difficult to give a tolerable Construction of Mr. St's. Words at the Beginning of this Paragraph, but however I shall endeavour at it. His Words are these, 'But if the Title of Reverend does not belong to Mr. C. because 'tis a Tribute due to all old Men in general, as Mr. B. argues, then it will follow, that the Title of Reverend does not belong to any one of those Ministers, whom Mr. B. calls Ornaments of Learning and Piety by Way of Peculiarity and supereminence, because 'tis due upon this Account to all Ministers, who are Ornaments of Learning and Piety in general. Now he makes me argue like himself, *viz.* falsely. For I allow this Title to all old Men in general, and consequently to Mr. C. (tho' not in that Sense he would have it) as being one of the Particulars that make up the General. But I take this to be the Quibble, that if the Title of Reverend belongs to all Ministers in general, then it does not belong to any one (that is, any single Minister) by way of Peculiarity and Supereminence, because all claim it. However this is not *ad idem*, for admit any particular Minister does not claim this Title supereminently in respect of the



rest of the Ministers of God's Word, yet he does in respect of the People *Anabaptists, Presbyterians, &c.* and all those who were never admitted into holy Orders.

In the following Words of this Paragraph Mr. St. seems to fear 'that many of our Ministers must be refus'd this Title of Reverend, if it be restrain'd to those who are Ornaments of Learning and Piety, and yet thinks I wou'd not scruple to give such Persons the Title of Reverend had I an Occasion to write to 'em ; then he extols Mr. C——'s Knowledge in the Scriptures, acquir'd thro' his long and attentive Study of 'em, and his exemplary Piety and Vertue, which abundantly compensate for his want of Learning. But there was no Reason why M. St. should restrain the Title of Reverend to Men of this Character. I am sure I did not, tho' had I done so, there may more claim it rightly in a true Church, than can in a pretended, schismatical one. There is a twofold call to the ministerial Function, an inward, and an outward ; the Inward call respects the Disposition of a Person for such an Employment ; \* but it is the outward, or else an extraordinary one that authorizes him to execute the priestly Office.

---

\* Rom. 10. 15, Jerem. 14. 14. Jerem. 17. 15.

Office. And that Minister who wants these Ornaments of Learning and Piety to some Degree, has notwithstanding an outward Call to warrant him in the Discharge of the sacred Function; so that was I to write to such a Person, I should not scruple to give him the Title of Reverend, because he claims it from the Relation he bears between God and Man. Tho' at the same time, let Mr. C. and the rest of his pretended Ministers be never so great Ornaments of Learning and Piety they can lay no Claim to the Title of Reverend in the Sense to which I restrain it, because they have no more Power to warrant them in the Execution of the priestly Office, than the mahometan Musty.

*Ad §. 5.* In this Paragraph according to Mr. St. I have not only impair'd my Honour, but made a Breach of Charity (I suppose of Faith too, because not great enough to endue me to believe that Mr. C. is a true Pastor) 'by reproaching the venerable old Man with sowing Feuds and Animosities among Christians, without any Regard to Charity, and so making him no more than sounding Brass or a tinkling Cymbal. Whether I have made a Breach of Charity by accusing the venerable old Man with these enormous Practices, or whether there be any Necessity (as he sup-

F 4

poses)

poses) of looking into Mr. C——'s Heart to frame this Accusation, let the World judge. I think his Actions sufficient for this, without looking any farther. For is not that Man highly uncharitable, who maintains and preaches such Doctrines, as conclude most of the World under the State of eternal Perdition from the early times of Christianity even till this Day, unless we admit they were sav'd by extraordinary and uncovenanted acts of God's Mercy? And does not Mr. C. do this when he declares Infant Baptism to be a Nullity? And is it not a plain Demonstration that he thinks it to be a Nullity, when he re-baptizes those who have been baptiz'd in their Infancy? Is not that Person uncharitable who preaches such Doctrine as makes it impossible for Christians to dwell together in the same Communion, and frequent the same Places of Worship? And does not Mr. C. do this, when he allows and encourages People to separate from an establish'd Church upon Points that are Disputable, when at the same time they agree in those which are fundamental? Nay, \* Mr. Tomb's a great Defender of *Antipædobaptism* in his Answer to Mr. Marshal, who said, 'That the Teachers of this Opinion, 'where-

---

\* *Tombs against Marshal*, P. 31.



‘where-ëver they prevail, take their Prose-  
‘lytes wholly off from the Ministry of  
‘the Word, Sacraments, and all other Acts  
‘of Christian Communion both publick and  
‘private, with any but those of their own  
‘Opinion. Mr. Tombs I say expresses an ab-  
‘horrence of this Practice, and replies; this  
‘is indeed a wicked Practice, justly to be  
‘abhorred. The making of Sects upon Dif-  
‘ference of Opinions, reviling, separating  
‘from their Teachers and Brethren other-  
‘wise Faithful, because there is not the  
‘same Opinion in disputable Points; or in  
‘clear Truths not fundamental; is a thing  
‘too frequent in all sorts of Dogmatists,  
‘&c. I look upon it as one of the greatest  
‘Plagues of Christianity. You shall have  
‘me join with you in shewing my Detesta-  
‘tion of it. There is no doubt but this  
Gentleman had in Mind the Advice and  
Caution of the holy Apostles concerning  
such Doings, to instance only in \* *St Paul,*  
*Now I beseech you Brethren, mark them which*  
*cause Divisions and Offences, contrary to the*  
*Doctrine which ye have learn’d, and avoid them.*  
*For they that are such, serve not our Lord*  
*Jesus Christ, but their own Belly; and by good*  
*Words and fair Speeches deceive the Hearts*  
*of the Simple.*

So

---

\* Rom. 16, 17, 18. 2 Cor. 13, 12. 1 Pet. 5, 14.

So that (as Mr. St. says) let the good People of *Agmondesham* (a fine Wheedle!) judge for themselves, and if there are now any Feuds and Animosities among 'em on the Account of Religion, I suppose they know to whom to ascribe them, *viz.* to Mr. C. and other schismatical Preachers.

*Ad* §. 6. But Mr. St. 'thinks 'tis time 'to have done with this part of my Letter, 'which he should not have dwelt on so 'long, had not I insulted Mr. C. with an 'Incivility equal to my Absurdity, and affronted good Manners, as much as I have 'done good Sense. However, this is all suppos'd, and not one thing prov'd; I question not but I have sufficiently clear'd myself from Absurdity, and by doing so, have shown that I have not offended good Sense. If I have been guilty of ill Manners, it must be in denying Mr. C. the Title of Reverend in an Ecclesiastical Sense, but at that rate I shall always be unmannerly, unless Mr. St. can prove him to be a true Pastor.

*Ad* §. 7. And now Mr. St. after having spent abundance of Quibble about the Title of Reverend, at last arrives at the Proposition laid down to disprove Mr. C—'s ordinary Vocation in the Ministry; and by the way, he is pleas'd to make these Reflections, *viz.* 'That I needed not to have put my

' my self to the trouble of formally proving  
' that the \* *Commission of Christ did not only*  
' *respect the Apostles to whom it was immediatly*  
' *given, but all true Ministers to the end of the*  
' *World*, because he presumes Mr. C. wou'd  
' readily have granted it. Then he carps at  
' the little *Greek Quotation*, because I made  
' no Remarks upon the Original Text to Elu-  
' cidate the English Translation; and lastly,  
' he approves not of the scrap of Latin, my  
' Philosophical Axioms, and Syllogisms; be-  
' cause I wrote to one whom I thought al-  
most ignorant of his Primer.

Now whether Mr. C. wou'd have readi-  
ly granted that the Commission of our Sa-  
viour did include a Succession of Ministers,  
to the end of the World, I am not capable  
to determine, nor perhaps Mr. St. himself;  
however, if he wou'd have granted this, I  
can't find the Proof to be superfluous, be-  
cause had he been put to the Tryal, he cou'd  
not regularly have made it appear, and  
therefore in doing this, I did not only rub  
up his Memory, but inform his Judgment.  
And if Mr. St. allows thus much, *i. e.* Succe-  
sion to be included in the Commission of  
our Saviour, why does he reject Apostolical  
Succession, as not necessary for the Qualifica-  
tion of Ministers? But perhaps he will  
say

---

\* Matt. 28, 19, 20.



say he has not allow'd thus much, for his Words are *true Ministers*, which he supposes may be without Succession. If then by these Words he means not the same thing that I did by Apostolical Succession, why is he so Equivocating and Disingenuous in representing my Argument? My Argument was, to prove that Christ's Commission to the Apostles did include them and all such, only as shou'd successively derive Authority from them. If therefore Mr. *Stennet* has any other meaning in this place than this by the Words *true Ministers*, I not only charge him with Equivocation, but likewise challenge him to prove, how there can be true Ministers without Apostolical Succession? Those who pretend to the Ministry, and at the same time, derive not their Authority from the Apostles, are such Ministers in the Christian Priesthood, as were *Korah, Dathan and Abiram*, in that of the Jews; that is, they set up themselves, or are Constituted by the People, who have just the same Authority to warrant them, in the intermeddling with sacred things under the Gospel, as those had under the Law, *viz.* none at all.

But why Mr. *St.* should take Offence at the little Greek Quotation *ἐδόθη μοι πᾶσα ἐξουσία*, &c. I understand not. That so small a thing shou'd come under so severe a Censure?

sure? What a terrible business must it have been, had I transcrib'd the whole Verse? I thought there was no necessity to Criticise upon the Original, to Elucidate the the English Translation, because that was clear enough in it self; but however, I made Remarks upon the import of it, and that was to my purpose. And where the Crime was in quoting some of, and making Observation upon the Original, I know not, unless it be unlawful to quote Scripture; for the Original alone is pure Scripture, the English is but a Translation of Scripture.

But belike Mr. St. says, 'I thought it very Edifying to adorn my Letter with a little *Greek*, as I do afterwards with a Scrap or two of Latin, my Philosophical Axioms, and Syllogisms. Now here are at least two Sheets made of one, and four of two; for I produc'd but one Axiom and one Syllogism, and if Scraps of Latin and Greek be not Edifying, yet they are Ornamental; so that I have committed nothing Indecent upon this Account.

But Mr. St. blames me in that I did this when I wrote to a Man, whom at the same time I thought almost ignorant of his Primer; very well! And upon this Consideration I put what I wrote into English, and therefore if he understands his Mother Tongue,

Tongue, he may know the Meaning of it.

The Syllogism is the next thing that is found Fault with, but without Reason. For a Syllogism is the most compendious thing to inform the Judgment, confute the Cavils, and confound the Obstinacy of Erroneous Persons, altho' they know not how to resolve it into its first Principles, and are uncapable of understanding Mood and Figure. And this is the Reason why all Difenters are such deadly Enemies to Syllogisms, because these are as deadly Enemies to Falsity, which spreads it self inightily thro' the whole Body of Fanaticism. Take another Instance, Mr. St. himself grants, 'That those who instruct others, ought to meditate upon Scripture, and make use of various Annotations, and other Writings to explain it, that are extant in the English Tongue, as supposing they at the same time want human Learning; and if so, this Syllogism may be form'd, viz.

Whosoever he be that can't read one Word of the Scripture, nor make use of various Annotations that are extant in the English Tongue to explain it, is unfit for a Preacher.

But there is a certain Person who preaches among the *Anabaptists*, who can't read  
one



one Word of the Scripture, nor make use of various Annotations that are extant in the English to explain it.

Therefore, that certain Person who teaches among the *Anabaptists*, &c. is unfit for a Preacher.

Now this Syllogism flashes Conviction, and arraigns this ignorant Fellow of Impudence in his bold Undertaking, and the *Anabaptists* at least of Imprudence for making choice of him to be a Preacher, who is unfit for that Office, if they agree with Mr. St's own Concession.

Besides the Syllogism which was brought to disprove Mr. C's ordinary Vocation in the Ministry, was built upon the preceding Axiom, which is a self-evident Principle, and so was edifying to any that wou'd give their Attention. For I shew'd from the Text, that the Power of Ordination was first in Christ himself, as being Θεὸς καὶ ἄνθρωπος, both God and Man, and because it was a Free Gift, it was appropriated to those particular Persons, to whom it was given, and so not at every ones Claim or Disposal. And from hence I resolv'd the whole into this Axiom, *Nil dat quod in se non habet*, nothing can give that which it self has not; and therefore seeing this Gift was bestow'd by our Saviour upon none beside the Apostles, it naturally follows, That those who  
pre-

pretend to administer the Word and Sacraments, shou'd derive their Authority from Apostolical Succession; otherwise they are Usurpers of the sacred Function, and claim a Power, which they never had a Right to. This is the plain Content of the Syllogism, and is as clear as the Sun-beams; and therefore Mr. St. was not offended with the Axiom and Syllogism, merely as such, but because the Syllogism built upon undoubted Truth, made it evident, that he and the rest of his pretended Teachers, have no Warrant or Authority to countenance their bold and presumptuous Undertaking, seeing they are not able to give the least Hint, how, when or where they came by the ministerial Power.

*Ad* §. 8, 9. Mr. St. at last is got to the Argument whereon the whole Strefs lies to disprove Mr. C's ordinary Vocation in the Ministry, *viz.* That 'if Mr. C. has a Right 'of administering the Word and Sacraments, 'he must prove his Mission from Apostolical 'Succession, or a continu'd Succession of 'Ministry from the Apostles. But Mr. 'C. has had no continu'd Succession of Ministry from the Apostles, Therefore he has 'no Right of Administring the Word and 'Sacraments, &c.

To this Mr. St. objects, That 'I am not 'aware, that if this Argument proves any thing

‘ thing, it proves too much, and will shake  
‘ the Authority of the Ministers of the  
‘ Church of *England*, and indeed of all other  
‘ Churches, as well as that of Mr. C. For I  
‘ desire Mr. B. would produce one Minister  
‘ who is able clearly to prove the successive  
‘ Derivation of his Ministry from Hand to  
‘ Hand without Interruption from the Apo-  
‘ stles.— Other Objections he raises against  
‘ this Position from the Defect of Records.  
‘ — And from the Peoples being dissatis-  
‘ fied in this Case, unless they were capable  
‘ of examining the History of the Church  
‘ for above 1600 Years, &c.

But before Mr. St. had pish'd away an uninterrupted Succession of Ministers from the Apostles, he ought first to have given an Answer to what I brought to prove that such a Succession was necessary (in an ordinary way) for the Qualification of Ministers; if at the same time we admit that there can be given no Proof of such a Succession among us. But alas! he found this not only difficult, but impossible, and therefore instead of this (as we before observ'd) he nibbles at the little Greek Quotation, the Philosophical Axioms, and Syllogisms, as he is pleas'd to call one Axiom, and one Syllogism, and this he thinks sufficient for his Purpose, without shewing either of their being mis-grounded, or that they were



impertinent to that, which they were brought to prove. And if he thinks such Flams will pass for right Reasoning, he entertains a very slender Opinion of the Wisdom of this Age; and seems to intimate that the rest of Mankind are full as ignorant as those of his own Sect; and that because he can bubble a few silly People out of their Christian Names, he may at the same Rate thrust his unreasonable Impositions upon the whole World. And therefore seeing Mr. St. has not shewn where the Invalidity of the Argument lay, which was produc'd to demonstrate the Necessity of deriving the ministerial Authority from Apostolick Hands, but instead of proving the contrary, is only pleas'd to take Notice that I quoted part of the Original Text, that there were philosophical Axioms and Syllogisms in the Case, this might be sufficient for the present, to induce us to think, that what I said in this Point was firm and true, without making any further Proof of the Matter till he shall shew it to be false, or at least nothing to the Purpose. For I appeal to the Sense of Mankind, whether it does not wonderfully invalidate my Assertion, to say that Mr. B. being about to prove the Necessity of deriving the ministerial Authority from Apostolick Hands, quoted Part of the Original Text, laid down  
Phi-

philosophical Axioms, and form'd Syllogisms? If this will carry the Stamp of solid Reason, I confess Mr. St. has overturn'd my whole Fabrick, and those of his own Party, who can read, may give a satisfactory Reply to the most learned Author in the World, for 'tis but saying Mr. such a one, being about the Proof of such a Proposition, suppose Infant Baptism, in doing of it, he quoted part of the Original Text, laid down Axioms, and made Syllogisms, and then down tumbles the whole Building, the Author is baffl'd, and what he said was nothing to the Purpose; so that at this Rate, the only way to overcome an Antagonist, is to repeat what himself wrote. This would indeed be an excellent way to maintain the dissenting Cause against the Church of *England*, because what they write very seldom amounts to a much higher Answer.

But when Mr. St. affirms, that this Argument taken from Apostolical Succession shakes the Authority of the Church of *England*, and all other Churches besides that of Mr. C's. he seems to forget the Constitution of the Church of *England*, and that of foreign Churches. It does indeed shake the Authority of Mr. C's Church, if I may by an Abuse of the Word apply it to a collected Number of Schif-

matical and Seditious Persons; but it does no harm to those which are real and true Churches, for their Foundations are laid upon a Rock; against which no Storm or Tempest can prevail, much less a few Quibbles and petty Sophisms.

As Episcopacy was planted by the \* Apostles themselves, so we find that the Reformers from the Superstitions of the Church of *Rome*, did approve and embrace the same, as an Apostolical Institution.

The *Waldenses* affirm'd, That they had lawful Bishops, and a lawful uninterrupted Succession from the Apostles.

The *Bohemians* kept to Episcopal Government: As we have their own Testimony in the Preface of their Book, Entitled, *Ratio, Disciplina, Ordinisq; Ecclesiastici in unitate fratrum Bohemorum*; Publish'd by themselves.

The *Lutherans* retained Bishops as Apostolical both in name and thing, in the Kingdoms of *Sweden* and *Denmark*, and the thing under another name of Superintendents in *Germany*.

The

---

\* Habemus annumerare eos, qui ab Apostolis instituti sunt episcopi in Ecclesiis, & successores eorum usque ad nos qui nil tale docuerunt, neque cognoverunt, quale ab his deliratur. — sed quoniam valde longum est, in hoc tali volumine omnium Ecclesiarum enumerare successiones, maximæ, & antiquissimæ, & omnibus cognitæ, a gloriosissimis duobus Apostolis Petro & Paulo Romæ fundatæ & constitutæ Ecclesiæ, Sc. *Irenæus*, lib. 3. c. 3.



*Mr. Stennett's Remarks, &c.* 61

The Confession of † *Saxony* is subscribed by seventeen Superintendents.

The || *Suevick* Confession expostulates upon great Injury done to their Churches, as tho' the Subversion of the Dignity and Power of their Prelates was intended. And in the \* Rights of the Civil Magistrate, they are expressly for the Divine Jurisdiction of Bishops. So were also the *Zuinglians* or *Helvetians* in *Switzerland*.

How far *Calvin* was for this Government. (to omit all other Proofs) may be seen in his † Institutions.

Nay those of the *Geneva* Platform, his Successors; are so far from opposing Episcopacy as Apostolical, that they look upon their being depriv'd of it, as a great Unhappiness, and make Necessity their only Plea: Thus they have publicly own'd, in their late Letter to the famous University of *Oxford*. And when the Divine Right of their Government was asserted in the Synod of *Dort*, they were so far from opposing of it as such, that the President in the Name of

G 3

the

---

† Harm Confess. sec. 19. p. 290. || Sect. 11. p. 85.

\* Cap. 33. See more by Mr. Durel.

† Verum si rem omisso vocabulo intuemur, reperiemus veteres Episcopos non aliam regendæ Ecclesiæ formam voluisse fingere quam Deus verbo suo præscripsit. *Calv. Instit. l. 4. c. 4. Sec. 4.*

the rest stood up, and said, \* *Domine, non licet nobis esse tam felices*, we may not be such happy Men.

And as Episcopal Government is by all Churches allow'd to be Divine and Apostolical, so we never wanted that Government till the Times of our late Rebellion, after which it was (by the miraculous Favour of God) restor'd. For as we can't give the least instance of its Defection, so in History we shall always find the same Government on foot, when there is the least Occasion given to take notice of it. And because Mr. St. has put me to an unnecessary Trouble, in requiring the Proof of that which all the World grants, I shall for my own Ease, and better Expedition, venture to transcribe the Substance of what the Learn'd and Right Reverend, the Bishop of *Worcester*, has said, in his † Historical Account of Church-Government, &c. to prove that Episcopacy was settled here, as it was in other Countries.

‘ *First*, we find at the Council of *Arles*,  
 ‘ (which was call'd by *Constantine* the Great,  
 ‘ in the Year 314) as there were some of all  
 ‘ the three Orders out of every one of the  
 ‘ *Western*

---

\* Bishop *Hall* in his Divine Right of Episcopacy, par. 1. cap. 1. † Cap. 3. p. 71, 72, 73, 74. &c.

'*Western* Provinces, so there were || out of  
'*Britain*, three Bishops, one Priest, and one  
'Deacon.— What the Power of each Bi-  
'shop was then in his Diocese, it may partly  
'be understood from the eighteenth Canon  
'of that Council— as it is in that ancient  
'Manuscript of the Councils in the Library  
'at *Sarum*, which was writ before the *Nor-*  
'*man* Conquest. These are the Words of it,  
'\* For the Deacons of *Rome*, that they take  
'not upon them there, on their own Account  
'but that Honour be reserved to the Presby-  
'ters. And that the Presbyters do nothing  
'without leave of the Bishop. Which  
Words set forth the Episcopal Power to the  
same Effect, with those in the † Epistles of  
*Ignatius* Bishop of *Antioch*, often produced in  
defence of Episcopal Authority.— 'With-  
'in twelve Years after the Council of *Arles*  
'was the first *Nicene* Council. — Among  
'the Canons of this Council, we have ex-  
'press mention of Bishops, Priests and Dea-  
'cons, which three Orders are therein sup-  
posed

G 4

---

|| Concil. Arelat. Subscript. post Canones.

\* De Diaconis urbicis, ut non aliquid pro se ibi præsumant, sed Honor Presbyteris reservetur. Et Presbyteri sine Consensu Episcopi nihil faciant. Concil. Arelat. i. Can. 18.

† Πάντες τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ἀκολουθεῖτε, ὡς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ, ὡς τοῖς ἀποστόλοις ἵνα ὁ διακὼν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐξουσιᾷ. Μηδεὶς χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἢ ἀνγκύλων εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. *Epist. ad Smyrn. cap. 8.*



' posed to be in all Churches; and in the  
 ' fifth, eighth, twelfth, thirteenth, sixteenth,  
 ' eighteenth and nineteenth, the Bishop is  
 ' spoken of, as having the sole Power of Or-  
 ' dination and Jurisdiction.— And that  
 ' the British Church consented to these Ca-  
 ' nons, we have more than Presumption for  
 ' it from the Emperour himself; who decla-  
 ' ring that the Council's Rule concerning  
 ' *Easter* was receiv'd in the Provinces, saith  
 ' || expressely, it was receiv'd in *Britain*.—  
 ' Sure enough the *Nicene* Creed was receiv'd  
 ' by the Bishops of *Britain*, as well as by  
 ' those of the other Provinces which were  
 ' not present at the Council: So much ap-  
 ' pear'd by \* their Letters to St. *Hilary*, and  
 ' † the great *Athanasius*. It also appears, that  
 ' they approv'd of the Judgment of the *Sar-*  
 ' *dican* Council in Behalf of *Athanasius* a-  
 ' gainst his Adversaries — And tho' it does  
 ' not appear that any of the British Bishops  
 ' were then present at *Sardica*--- Yet several of  
 ' our Bishops were present soon after at the  
 ' Council of *Ariminum* saith *Sulpitius Severus*,  
 ' who † tells us, that three of them had their  
 ' Bishopricks so meanly endow'd, that they  
 ' were forc'd to lie there at the publick  
 ' Charge. ; And

---

|| *Euseb. Life of Const. M. III. cap. 18.*

\* *Hilar. I. de Synodis.*

† *Athanas. Epist. ad Jovianum. A.*

|| *Sulpit. hist. l. 2.*

*Mr. Stennett's Remarks, &c.* 65

‘ And that this Church continu’d under  
‘ the same Episcopal Government, after this  
‘ Island was broken off from the Roman  
‘ Empire ; (beside what may be gathered  
‘ from the Lives of *Dubricius*, *David*, *Pa-*  
‘ *ternus*, and many other of the old British  
‘ Bishops) we find it in two unquestiona-  
‘ ble Authors, which are all that from their  
‘ own Knowledge have given us any In-  
‘ formation of the things of that Age.

‘ One was *Gildas* that writ about the  
‘ Year five hundred and fixty, a little more  
‘ than a hundred Years after the Saxons  
‘ came hither. He \* tells us, that they be-  
‘ ing Heathens, had destroy’d Religion where  
‘ they came ; they kill’d the Governours of  
‘ the Church with the Presbyters, and Peo-  
‘ ple : Where, that he means Bishops by the  
‘ Governours, it appears by † that which  
‘ follows after. For he || shews the Bri-  
‘ tains that escap’d out of their Hands had  
‘ still the three Orders remaining among  
‘ them, of Bishops, or other Sacerdotes, or  
‘ Clerks.— What it was about forty Years  
‘ after, when *Gregory* the first sent his Mis-  
‘ sionaries hither, we have no better Au-  
‘ thority to inform us than \* *Beda*, who  
‘ liv’d within a hundred Years of that time.  
‘ He

---

\* *Gild. de excid. Brit.* l. 1. p. 1009. † *Ib.* l. 2. p. 10. 18.  
|| *Ib.* l. 2. p. 10. 17. \* *Bed. hist.* l. 27. p. 85.

' He tells us, that when *Austin* the Monk  
 ' enquir'd how he ought to behave him-  
 ' self toward the Bishops of the French and  
 ' of the Britains ; the Pope, that knew  
 ' what his Monk would be at, answered  
 ' him to the Point, we give thee no Au-  
 ' thority over the Bishops of *France*, for we  
 ' ought not to deprive the Bishop of *Arles*  
 ' of the Authority which he hath receiv'd  
 ' from us, to be their Metropolitan,——  
 ' But † all the Bishops of *Britain* we com-  
 ' mit to thee——But to our Purpose, I can-  
 ' not but observe ; that in *Britain*, as well  
 ' as in *France*, there were Bishops that  
 ' might pass Muster well enough, if the  
 ' Pope might be allow'd to lord it over  
 ' them.

' Accordingly, when *Austin* came to treat  
 ' with the Britains, we find || that the Trea-  
 ' ty on their Part was managed first by  
 ' their Bishops and learn'd Men, without  
 ' any mention of Number ; and afterwards  
 ' by their seven Bishops and many learn'd  
 ' Men with them.

' And therefore, except that Dispute a-  
 ' bout the Supremacy, there was no other  
 ' Difference in Point of Government, be-  
 ' tween that which the Romans brought  
 ' hither

---

† *Ib.* p. 86. || *Bed. hist.* II. 2. p. 110. 117.



‘ hither into *England*, and that which at  
‘ their coming they found settled here in the  
‘ British Church. On both Parts there was  
‘ a Dioceſan Epiſcopacy, the ſame that was  
‘ then in *France*, and in *Italy*, from which  
‘ Countries *Auſtin* brought his Patterns  
‘ along with him: And as well the Bri-  
‘ tains as the Engliſh have continued that  
‘ Epiſcopacy by Succeſſion in moſt of the  
‘ ſame Biſhops Sees that then were to this  
‘ Day.

And therefore ſeeing it is plain that E-  
piſcopal Government was univerſally recei-  
v’d in the Church as an Apoſtolic Inſti-  
tution, and that it met not with any Op-  
poſition as ſuch, but from a few late Aſpi-  
ring Perſons, who had a Mind to ſhow  
more Reading than Judgment, and have  
been baſſ’d out of all their vain and idle  
Pretences by the learn’d Doctor *Hammond*,  
and other Champions for the Epiſcopal Cauſe,  
and ſeeing that we have as clear a Proof  
of our Succeſſion of Government from the  
very firſt Plantation of it, as things of this  
Nature are capable of, Mr. *St.* acts very  
unreaſonably, when he demands a Proof of  
every perſonal Succeſſion from the times of  
the Apoſtles down to our own. For a Suc-  
ceſſion of Government neceſſarily includes  
a Succeſſion of Perſons in the ſame Govern-  
ment.

ment. And altho' we can't in all Churches find a particular and accurate Catalogue of the Succession of every individual Bishop, do we find any Instance of any other sort of Government, or that this Succession has been so broken as that it never return'd? If this might be done, it were something to the purpose, but it is not so much as pretended in the Exception.

But otherwise because the particular Succession of Persons in any Bishoprick has not been preserv'd, to conclude that therefore there was no Evidence of the Episcopal Form of Government, or that it has been interrupted, is the same thing as if any Man should conclude, that there never was any ancient Monarchs in the World, because in all their Histories there be some Flaws, Defects, or Disagreements as to the Names of Persons in the Succession: Or discard *Adam* from being the Root and Parent of all Mankind, because we cannot trace out the particular Descent of every Person in his Generation from our own Time, up to that of our Great-Grandmother *Eve's*.

But I think it sufficient, that where we find an establish'd Monarchy, altho' we meet with some Intervals of History, in which the Princes Names then reigning, are not certain, or forgotten, and yet have no Records to show that the Government  
was

was chang'd into a Common-wealth, to conclude without Scruple, that the Monarchical Government was all that time preserv'd. And that is the Case of Episcopal Government in the Church; for at all Times, and in all Places, where and when Records have been preserv'd, the same Form was always practis'd, and therefore we may very safely and rationally conclude, that the same was observ'd in those short Chasms and Intervals of Time (if we allow any such) in which they have been lost: Tho' the Register of particular Persons is not so wonderful defective, but in many Places their very Names are plainly enough recorded.

And therefore I shall beg leave to conclude thus, that, That Form of Government (which has been by the Consent of the Catholick Church in all Ages, and in Places, as Apostolick, and not the least Instance can be given of it's Defection) is from Apostolical Succession uninterrupted:

But such is the Government of the Church of *England*: Therefore her Government is from Apostolical Succession, and consequently her Ministers have a Right of administering the Word and Sacraments from Apostolical Succession.

What Mr. *St.* objects concerning the Peoples incapacity of being satisfied with the lawfulness of their Ministry, if we make  
Apo-



Apostolical Succession necessary, it's not to the Purpose. For admit they can't give this Proof it matters not, so long as others can. We will excuse them from this laborious Search into Antiquity, if they will peaceably walk in obedience to their Governours that are set over them, as they ought to do. For though they are of themselves insufficient to arrive at a plenary Satisfaction in this Point, yet they have as much Reason to rest contentedly under the Ministry of the Church of *England*, as under that of the Dissenters, because we can at least claim as much Power to warrant us in the Discharge of the ministerial Office, as themselves can, admit we could give no Proof of Apostolical Succession. And therefore they ought not to erect their own new fanciful Models in Opposition to the present Establishment, when in so doing, they not only bring a Scandal upon Christianity in general, but create Disturbances in Church and State. And I must over and above all this tell, Mr. *St.* that where Truth is concern'd, there we must not tamely give up the Cudgels, and comply with Falshood to please the Multitude: 'Tis a Command in Scripture, \* *Follow not a Multitude to do Evil.*

'Next

---

\* *Exod.* 23 '2.

Next Mr. St. says, 'Neither am I better founded when I say afterwards, That Mr. C. can't have such a Succession because the Names and Tenets of the *Anabaptists* were not heard of till the Middle of the third Century. For suppose an *Anabaptist* was not heard of till that Time, that does not hinder but the first *Anabaptist* Minister might derive his Ministry from the Apostles as well as others, and transmit it by Succession down to future Ages as well as they.—— Next if I pretend the Ministry thus transmitted would cease to be lawful (as supposing Anabaptism Heresie) then this would fall hard upon the Church of *England*, who have deriv'd Orders immediately from Hereticks, &c.

*Ad §. 10.* But this is as much to the purpose, as what he has said before, *viz.* not at all. For I spoke nothing concerning Ordination deriv'd from Hereticks, nor mention'd one Word of their ceasing to be valid, if they were. There must be something said by those who endeavour to support a bad Cause, otherwise it would quickly fall; but when once the Impertinence, and Weakness of their Arguments is discover'd, it makes bad worse, and plainly shews they contend not for Truth, but obstinately to maintain Falshood.

I grant, That those Persons, who have been invested with the Power of Ordination, and afterwards lapse into Heresie, or Schism, ought to have their Hands tied from proceeding in their irregular Actions to the Disturbance of the Christian Church, by Ecclesiastical Censures. But at the same time they lose not the Power they were endow'd with, altho' they are kept from the Exercise of it. Such Persons after an Acknowledgment of their Errors, and a publick satisfactory Recantation, may be again restor'd to their primitive Stations, and put others into the Ministry without Re-ordinations.

But because Ordination has been immediately transmitted from Heretical Hands to other Men, \* it does not by any Means become invalid; for any heretical Bishop that has been rightly ordained *quoad Formam*, does still remain in the Power to ordain others. He can give them the same Power he is invested with himself, altho' he can empower no Man to preach, or maintain his Errors; for this he never had any Commission, for the other he had: So that he no sooner pretends to give a Power to another

to

---

\* Thus much St. Jerome grants in his Book *Contra Luciferianos*, and St. Augustine in that he writes against the *Donatists*.



to propagate his Anti-scriptural Doctrines, but it as soon ceases to be Valid; nor does he any sooner give the Power of Ordination, which he was before Legally invested with, but it as soon takes Effect. And therefore, although many of the Bishops of the Church of *England* before the Reformation, were ordained by those who were tainted with Superstition and Idolatry, yet this their Ordination was firm and valid, because they receiv'd it from those who were invested with the Power of Ordination before them, and so could Authorize others in the same Commission.

This will appear yet more plain, if we take a familiar Instance. Suppose a Prince to have given to a particular number of Men Authority to preside over Civil Affairs within his own Dominion, that they should under him have supreme Jurisdiction in all Temporal Causes, for the better and more impartial Administration of Justice; and knowing them to be Mortal, and that at some time, or other they must be taken away by Death, we will suppose him to have given them (for a Supply of their Mortality) Power to enstate others in the like Jurisdiction themselves had, even from one to another to the End of the World. And to make it Parallel to our Case, admit those Persons (like the Bishops of the Church be-

fore the Reformation) to have received from the Ancient Text and Letter of the Law, to have Taught, as well as to have embraced Errors; yet there is no Man so Irrational as to affirm, That, because of this their Corruption in Manners and Principles, they are depriv'd of the Authority at first given them. They may invest others with their own proper Jurisdiction, to wit, with a Power of Government in Civil Affairs, and of transmitting the same to other Persons: But they can Empower no Man to Act unjustly, to Forge Corrupt Glosses and Interpretations of the Law, or to pass an unjust Sentence, because they never received any such Power.

So that by the same Parity of Reason, although the Bishops of the Church of *England* received their Orders from those before them, who were vitiated with Doctrines repugnant to the Laws of God, yet this their Ordination was valid, because they had it from those who were invested with the Power of it, tho' not with a Power of Authorizing any Men in the Propagation of their own Personal Misconceptions; in doing this, they Transgress the Bounds of their Commission; in putting others into the same Jurisdiction with themselves, they did but what they ought, and had Authority for the doing of it.

And

And therefore, we will not go upon that wild Supposition of Mr. St's. That it's possible the first *Anabaptist* Minister might derive his Ministry from the Apostles as well as others, and transmit it by Succession down to future Ages as well as they, because there is not for many Centuries together, the least mention of any such Ministry in Ecclesiastical History, and so no Grounds, or Motives for such a Belief. He who can build his Faith upon such notional Foundations, and empty Surmises, may with equal Reason, Credit the fabulous Stories of the *Metamorphosis*, and rank *Mahomet* among true Prophets, from the Whispers of his Pigeon. If he can produce any *Anabaptist* Minister, who has been invested with the Power of Ordination (admitting Anabaptism to be Heresie) we will readily grant, That notwithstanding this Heretical Tenet, he has the Power of Ordination; tho' at the same time, we think it highly requisite to restrain him from the Exercise of it, after a Schismatical, or Heretical Manner.

So that my fine Discourse (as Mr. St. by way of Ironie calls it) remains in its full Force and Glory, notwithstanding his petty Cavils to the contrary, and by no means has fix'd me into a Labyrinth, tho' his way of Reasoning has himself, and those who adhere to it. But Mr. St. only makes a



bare supposition of the Possibility, that the Anabaptistical Ministry might be transmitted from the Apostles by Succession, and finding it impossible to produce any tolerable Proof that might shadow his Supposition, he therefore to remedy all Disasters, bethinks himself of his grand Emplastrum Καθολικόν, a Medicament made up with Republican Leaven, and infallibly Cures all Sores, if care be taken for Application. For by giving the Power of Ordination and Imposition of Hands to Lay-Elders, and the Election of Ministers to the People, he not only renders an uninterrupted Succession of the Ministry, ineffectual, but makes all Hereticks and Schismatics in the Christian World, true Ministers. For if the People have a Power of Election, and such Elders, or Ministers, as were by them allow'd to be invested with that Office before the Power of Ordination; then the *Muggletonian* has, or may have as true a Ministry as the *Anabaptist*, and the *Anabaptist* as the *Presbyterian*; nay, the *Socinians*, *Independants*, and all Sects that can be named, may have all a true Ministry. For all these have Multitudes of People under them, who (he says) have a right of Electing Ministers, and other Elders before them, who were, or may be allow'd (to wit, by themselves, for

for the Sense of the Catholick Church Condemns them) the Power of Ordination and Imposition of Hands. So that at this rate of Arguing, there can be no false Ministers in respect of there Mission, if there be any number of People to Elect, or any among them, who by themselves have been allow'd the Power of Ordination. And this Assertion does not only Confound the Notion of a Christian Church, which is a \* Society made up of one Faith, and one Priesthood, as was that of the *Jews*, but casts foul Aspersions upon the Practice of it in all Ages.

For as a worthy † Prelate of our own Church says, 'From Christ's time till this Day there was never any one Catholick in the Eastern, Southern, or Northern Churches, who profess'd himself to be Anti-Episcopal, but only such as were cast out for Hereticks or Schismaticks. The same I say of the Western Church for the first 1500 Years. Let him shew me but one form'd Church without a Bishop, or the Name of one Lay-Presbyter in all that time, who exercis'd or challeng'd Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, or the Power of the Keys in the Church before *Calvin's* Return in-

H 3

to

---

\* 2 Cor. 11. 2. 1 Cor. 10. 5. Rom. 11. 24. † *Bishop Bramh, against Baxt.* p. 57.

‘to Geneva, in the Year 1538. after he  
 ‘had subscrib’d the *Augustane* Confession  
 ‘and Apology for Bishops, and I’ll give him  
 ‘leave to be as Anti-Episcopal as he will. I  
 ‘will shew him the proper and particular  
 ‘Names of Apostles, Evangelists, Bishops,  
 ‘Presbyters, Deacons, in Scriptures, in Coun-  
 ‘cils, in Fathers, in Histories; if he can-  
 ‘not Name one particular Lay-Elder, it is  
 ‘because there never was any such thing  
 ‘in *Rerum natura* for 1500 Years after  
 ‘Christ.

In the next Place Mr. St. ‘wishes me to  
 ‘answer the Difficulties which the *Anaba-*  
 ‘*ptists* have publish’d against Infant Bap-  
 ‘tism, and demands a divine Precept for it.  
 ‘— Then he proves me egregiously igno-  
 ‘rant of Ecclesiastical History from the Pra-  
 ‘ctice of the ancient *Vaudois* and *Albigensis*,  
 ‘and *Tertullian*, when I say that those which  
 ‘denied Infant Baptism had no Being till the  
 ‘Year 1524, &c.

*Ad §. 11.* I must confess, That I can’t  
 espy where the Difficulty lies in answering  
 those Arguments which the *Anabaptists*  
 produce against the Baptism of Infants, be-  
 cause they are not one Jot to the Purpose,  
 but fall as foul upon the Covenant of Cir-  
 cumcision, as upon Infant Baptism. And  
 I desire Mr. St. to inform us, that seeing  
 the Tenors of both Covenants are the same,  
 why



why we should not act according to them?  
\* Circumcision was a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith, and so is Baptism. And *Abraham* being the Father of all the Faithful, the Promise is come upon us also. And as the Children of *Abraham*, were Partakers of his Faith, so by the same Reason the Children of Christian Parents, have as much Right to partake of the Blessedness of the Promise, as had the Children of the Jews.

This is plain from the Words of *St. Peter*, For after he had ended his Sermon, 'he  
'applies two Comforts unto them, † Amend  
'your Lives, and be Baptiz'd, and ye shall  
'receive the Gift of the Holy Ghost. And  
'then he infers, For the Promise is unto  
'you and to your Children.

'|| The Promise; what Promise? What?  
'Why the Promise of Sanctification by the  
'Holy Ghost. By what Means? Why, by  
'Baptism. For 'tis expressly, be Baptiz'd, and  
'ye shall receive. And as expressly, This  
'Promise is unto you, and to your Children.

And because this is such a plain Text of Scripture, as warrants the Practice of the *Pædo-baptists*, their Adversaries run to a

H 4

foreign

---

\* Rom. 4. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17. † Act. 2. 38, 39.  
|| *Arch. Bish. Laud. against Fisher the Jesuite.* p. 56.

foreign Exposition of the Text, contrary to the General Sense of the Church in all Ages, and so confound the Holy Scriptures by interpreting them contrary to the Analogy of Faith.

And seeing the Children of the Jews had a Right of entring into the Covenant by Virtue of their Parent's Faith, it necessarily follows, that if thus much be not granted to the Children of Christian Parents, That the Covenant of Grace under the Gospel is not enlarg'd, but extenuated. And such are the horrid Absurdities that flow from the Denial of Infant Baptism. So that altho' there be no exprefs Precept for it, and that we cannot gather it *πρὸς* in very Words from the Scriptures, yet we may *διὰ συνέπειαν* by good Consequence.

But as it is not my Business at present to enter into a particular Defence of Infant Baptism, so 'tis as impertinent of Mr. St. to require an Exprefs Precept for it. For if he holds that nothing may be done, but for which some exprefs Command of Scripture be produc'd, by this Rate of inferring he brings his own Party into the same rape with the *Pædo-baptists*; for they administer the Sacrament to Women, when at the same time there is no direct Command  
for

for the doing of it, because all the Words and Particles in the Original Texts are expressly limited to the Masculine Gender. And if he says this Practice is warrantable, because Women are included in Men, so by all the Laws of God and Nature Children are included in their Parents, and look'd upon as having a Right to share in the Blessings themselves enjoy.

But Mr. St. concludes my Ignorance in Ecclesiastical History from the Example of the ancient *Vaudois* and *Albigensis*, who deny'd Infant Baptism, which he says he has clearly proved in his Answer to *Russen*, pag. 81, 82, 83, 84.

Now I deny not that there have been particular Persons who rejected the Baptism of Infants, long before the time I speak of; but still I affirm it for a Truth, That there is no certain Evidence of any form'd Sect, Church, or Society of Men that oppos'd it (which was plainly my meaning) till those in *Germany* about the time I mention'd. And if Mr. St. argues my great Ignorance of Ecclesiastical History from the Practice of the ancient *Vaudois* and *Albigensis* by the same Reason I prove him greatly ignorant in Ecclesiastical History also. For the present *Waldenses*, or *Vaudois* in *Provence* and *Piedmont*, which are the Posterity of the Old,  
practise



practise the Baptism of Infants, and in the same they were found, when those of *Luther's* Reformation came to enquire concerning their Doctrine; and they affirm, That their Fore-Fathers always practised the same. And this is plain from *Perin's* History translated out of French by *Sampson Leguard*, and Published *Anno 1624*.

“ \* He brings in Objections and false Accusations laid upon that People. † And says he, The 4th Calumny was touching Baptism, which it is said, they denied to little Infants; but from this Imputation they quit themselves as followeth.

“ The Time and Place of those that are to be Baptized is not ordained, but the Charity and Edification of the Church, and Congregation, must serve for a Rule therein, &c.

“ And therefore they to whom the Children were nearest allied, brought their Infants to be Baptized, &c. And then he renders the Occasion of that Calumny.

“ True it is, That being constrained for some hundred Years, to suffer their Children to be baptized by the Priests of the Church of *Rome*, they deferred the doing thereof,

‘ thereof, as long as they could possibly,  
‘ because they had in Detestation those hu-  
‘ man Inventions, which were added to  
‘ that Holy Sacrament, which they held  
‘ to be but Pollutions thereof. And for  
‘ as much as their Pastors (which they  
‘ called *Barbes*) were many times abroad,  
‘ in the Service of their Churches, they  
‘ could not have the Sacrament of Baptism  
‘ administred to their Infants, by their own  
‘ Ministers: Which the Priests perceiving,  
‘ charged them thereupon with this Im-  
‘ posture, which not only their Adversa-  
‘ ries have believed, but divers others,  
‘ who have well approved of their Life  
‘ and Faith, in all other Points.

Again, \* ‘ King *Lewis* the 12th being in-  
‘ form’d by the Enemies of the *Waldenses*  
‘ dwelling in *Provence* of many grievous  
‘ Crimes, impos’d upon them, sent to make  
‘ inquisition in those Places, the Lord *Adam*  
‘ *Fume*, Mr. of Requests, and a Doctor of  
‘ *Sorbon*, call’d *Parvi*, who was his Con-  
‘ fessor. They visited all their Parishes and  
‘ Temples, and found neither Images ; nor  
‘ so much as the least shew of any Orna-  
‘ ments belonging to their Masses, and Ce-  
‘ remonies of the Church of *Rome* ; much  
‘ less any such Crimes as were impos’d  
‘ upon

‘ upon them, but rather that they kept  
 ‘ their Sabbaths duly, causing their Children  
 ‘ to be baptiz’d, according to the Order of  
 ‘ the primitive Church, teaching them the  
 ‘ Articles of the Christian Faith, and the  
 ‘ Commandments of God. To which the  
 ‘ King replied, they were better Men, than  
 ‘ he, or his People.

And to show that their Forefathers pra-  
 ctis’d the same with themselves, they pro-  
 duc’d a Proof from an ancient Book of theirs,  
 entituled the Spittual Almanack : Wherein  
 Infant Baptism is own’d and asserted. There  
 are also Confessions of the like import pro-  
 duc’d by many others ; but this is suf-  
 ficient.

So that if Mr. St. pretends that the an-  
 cient *Vaudois* were against Infant Baptism,  
 he intimates that he has better Knowledge  
 of their Practice, than themselves and sets,  
 his own private Sentiments against their  
 publick Confessions.

But we will grant that Mr. St——’s  
 Judgment has fail’d him in this Point. For  
 the *Cathari*, *Paterines*, *Lyonists*, *Petrobrusians*,  
*Albigenses*, tho differing in their Opinions  
 extremely from each other, were huddl’d  
 confusedly together, and call’d by the ge-  
 neral Name of the *Waldenses* ; so that it is  
 no wonder why strange and Heterodox O-  
 pinions are attributed to those who never



entertain'd them: And that they are thus falsely accus'd, seeing they had in detestation, and sought to reform themselves from the superstitions of the Roman Church, for there have not been wanting among the Papists who have represented *Luther, Calvin* and *Beza*, as Enemies to Infant Baptism. Besides many Authors who have sifted the Opinions of and writ against these People, accuse them with nothing in this Point; as may be seen, were it necessary to produce them.

What *Mr. St.* says concerning the Followers of *Gundulphus* is nothing to the Purpose; because they did not only deny Baptism to Infants, but esteem'd it as useless both to Infants and adult Persons, and so this Instance is of as much Force against him, as it is against the *Pedo-baptists*.

And indeed to accuse the antient *Vaudois* and *Albigensis* of holding Erroneous Doctrines, because those about them did, is to act as unjustly, as if I should accuse the Church of *England* for maintaining the Unlawfulness of baptizing Infants, because there be other Sects within the Bowels of her, who deny Infant Baptism, as the *Anabaptists*; and others who deny all Baptism with Water, as do the Quakers; or as if I should make these Men (as some Fanatics have done) Abettors of the Principles,

ples, as well as Authors of the late unnatural Rebellion, who kept tight to their Loyalty, and stood up stoutly in Defence of the ancient Laws, and Person of their Sovereign.

But after all, should I admit, that there have been particular Persons of so ancient a Date as he mentions, who deny'd Infant Baptism, it would do him but small Service, because this Opinion has been condemn'd by the Consent of the Catholick Church, and makes nothing against my Disproof of Mr. C——'s ordinary Vocation in the Ministry. So that where (after all this unprofitable Search) he found them, there I think it will not be amiss to leave 'em.

Only, I shall take notice of what he says about *Tertullian*, who speaks expressly against Infant Baptism, in these Words.

‘\* Therefore according to every ones  
‘ Condition, Disposition and Age, 'tis better  
‘ to delay Baptism, especially as to little  
‘ Children.

---

\* Itaque pro cujusque Personæ conditione ac dispositione, etiam ætate, cunctatio baptismi utilior est: præcipue tamen circa parvulos. Quid enim necesse est, sponsos periculo ingeri? Quia & ipsi per mortalitatem destituere promissiones suas possunt, & proventu malæ indolis falli. Dixit quidem Dominus, nolite illos prohibere ad me venire. Veniant ergo dum adolescunt, veniant dum discunt, dum quo veniant docentur: Fiant Christiani quum Christum nosse potuerint, *Tert de Baptism. l. 2, c. 18.*

‘Children. For why should the God-fa-  
‘thers be brought into Danger? For they  
‘may come short of their Promises by  
‘Death, or be deceiv’d by a Child’s pro-  
‘ving wicked. Our Lord says indeed, do not  
‘forbid them to come unto me. Therefore  
‘let them come when they are grown up;  
‘let them come when they learn, when  
‘they are taught whither to come: Let  
‘them be made Christians, when they can  
‘know Christ.

Here we ought in the first Place, to con-  
sider that this was a Person of very odd  
and singular Opinions, and at the writing  
hereof was probably an Adherent to the  
Heresie of the *Montanists*. And in the im-  
mediate following Words of this Chapter,  
he is contrary both to the Opinion and  
Practice of the *Anabaptists* themselves, who  
make it necessary for Persons to be bap-  
tiz’d so soon as they are capable of Un-  
derstanding and making a Confession of  
their Faith. † For he would have baptism  
put off till the time of Marriage: But if  
they marry not, or their Consort die, till  
the

---

† Non minori de causa innupti quoque procrastinandi,  
in quibus tentatio præparata est; tam virginibus per ma-  
turitatem, quam viduis per vacationem, donec aut nubant  
aut continentia corroborentur. Si qui pondus intelligant  
baptismi, magis timebunt consecutionem quam dilatio-  
nem. Fides integra secura est de salute, *Tert. de Bap-*  
*tism.* l. 2. c. 18.



the Flames of Lust are over, which very often lurk in old ruined Bodies. So that if Mr. St. cleaves to one of his singular Opinions, why does he not adhere to the other?

But this Instance from *Tertullian* is of so little Force against the Practice of baptizing Infants, that it is a greater Confirmation of it. For when he desires that innocent Age not to make such hast to Baptism, it is manifest that it was the Practice of the Church to baptize 'em. And when Mr St. produc'd this Quotation to confirm his Opinion, he forgot the old Rule, That a Logician or Orator ought to have a strict Care, they make not Use of such Arguments against their Adversaries, as may be retorted upon themselves.

In his next Paragraph, he makes it impossible to prove the Practice of baptizing Infants Apostolical. And presumes it difficult to produce one Proof that Infant Baptism was practic'd in the Church till near 200 Years after the Birth of Christ.

*Ad §. 12.* But in the first Place, St. *Austin* makes it of Apostolical Authority, take his Words, ' \* In this Matter if any Body require

---

\* Et si quanquam in hac re auctoritatem divinam quaeratur, quanquam quod universa tenet ecclesia, nec conciliis institutum, sed semper retentum est, non nisi auctoritate  
ap6-

'quire divine Authority, tho' that which  
'the whole Church uses, and has not been  
'instituted by Councils, but was ever re-  
'tain'd, is reasonably thought to be of A-  
'postolical Authority ; yet we may give  
'a true Estimate how profitable the Sacra-  
'ment of Baptism is to Infants from the  
'Circumcision of the Flesh, which the Peo-  
'ple of God formerly receiv'd, &c. And  
tho' there be no express mention of this  
Practice, yet that it was in Use, may be  
gathered by good Consequence from the  
Writers of that time, and those immedi-  
ately after. For 'tis plain they held the  
Doctrine of original Sin, as we find by  
what a Fellow-labourer with the Apostles  
says concerning Job. † ' That he was just,  
'blameless, true, a worshipper of God, ab-  
'staining from all evil. Yet for all this, he  
'condemns himself saying, there is no Bo-  
'dy clear from Pollution, tho' his Life be  
'but of one Day.

And therefore, seeing these Men held  
Baptism (as we may easily find in their

I

Wri-

---

apostolica traditum rectissime creditur: Tamen veraciter  
conjectare possumus, quid valeat in parvulis baptismi sa-  
cramentum, ex circumcisione carnis, quam prior populus  
accepit. St. August. contr. Donatist. l. 4. p. 433.

† Ἐπὶ ᾧ καὶ ἰωὴς ἔτι γέγραπται, ἰωὴς ὡς δίκαιος, καὶ  
ἀμεμπτός, ἀλιθινός, θεοσεβής, ἀπεχόμενος, ἀπὸ πάντων κακῶν.  
Ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ἐαυτοῦ κατηγορῶν λέγει. Οὐδείς καθάριος ἀπὸ ῥύπου,  
ἔσθ' ἐν μίᾳ ἡμέρᾳ ἢ ζῶν αὐτῷ. Clem. Rom. Ep. 1. 21 Corin.  
c. 17.

Writings) to be the ordinary Mean by which we are cleans'd from Original Pollution, it is reasonable to conclude they thought it necessary for Infants: And although the *Anabaptists* seem to comply with the Orthodox Tenet of Original Sin, yet in Effect, they disclaim it with the *Pelagians*. For otherwise, by making Infants guilty of Pollution thro' the Transgression of our first Parents, and Baptism as the ordinary Mean of washing away our Original Impurity, and at the same time to deny it 'em, they act as Unreasonably as that Man (who believing God able to preserve him by his extraordinary Mercy) rashly throws himself from the Top of a craggy Precipice, when he may with all grounds of safety walk thro' a Plain by the Foot of it.

Again, the Instance which was brought out of *Tertullian* against Infant Baptism, makes for the *Pædobaptists* tho', \* *Pamelius* thinks it spoken of those Infants whose Parents were Infidels. For this Father liv'd within 100 Years after the Apostles Time, and therefore when he speaks against the Practice of baptizing Infants 'tis plain this was no Innovation: And we must grant it to have been so long before him,

---

\* *Pamelius in Tertull. N. 126.*



him, that he knew not the time of its Commencement, admit it was not Apostolical; otherwise he would undoubtedly have given it severe Castigation, being contrary to his own Opinion: And from hence we may justly set this Practice much higher than Mr. *St.* viz. 200 Years after the Birth of Christ; and much higher yet, if we take our Epocha from the Time of his Crucifixion.

But it were an easie Matter to track the Practice of baptizing Infants up to the Apostolical Age from the Writings of \* *Justin* Martyr, † *Irenæus* and others who make Regeneration and Baptism to signify the same thing, and then apply it to Infants, as well as grown Persons, excluding all other Conversion, or Repentance; which the *Anabaptists* wholly confine to the Sense of the Word, Regeneration. But as this is not much to my Purpose, so I shall proceed to the Consideration of what Mr. *St.* says in his next Paragraph.

*Ad* §. 13. He pretends not to know the Meaning of that turn I gave in this Matter, when I say to Mr. C. 'You Mushroom-like sprung from the Earth in a Night's Space, and as soon disappear'd  
I 2 'again.

---

\* *Just. Martyr 2d Apology.* † *Irenæus, l. 2. c. 39. l. 3. c. 19.*

‘again. And to make what I said Non-sense he proceeds by Way of Interrogation after this Manner. ‘If the *Anabaptists* are ‘all vanish’d, what need had this Gentle-man to trouble his Head about them and ‘their Ministry? I do not say they are all vanish’d at present, tho’ they have all vanish’d. Then he ask’d, ‘If they still appear in the World and their Number is ‘much increas’d since the time he mentions, ‘why does he affirm that they soon disappear’d again after they sprung up? As if it were impossible any Sect should be suppress’d or extirpated after they have once appear’d: As to their Numbers and Increase at this Day, I answer, the more’s the Pity. Mushrooms often spring up in the Night, and are gone the next Day; they are more numerous, and of longer continuance at one time than another. And as it is with the growth of those Protuberances, so has it fared with the Ministry of the *Anabaptists*. They have sprung up, and after their Appearance been cut down, and wither’d. And therefore this is a firm Proof that they have no true Church, or Ministry, because of their total abolition; when our Saviour himself has promised, that the Gates of Hell shall not be able to prevail against her.

Mr.

Mr. St. says in the next Place, 'As to the  
'Pranks which some German *Anabaptists*  
'play'd, they are no worse than have been  
'often play'd by the *Pædobaptists* of different  
'Nations, as would be easie to recriminate  
'if it were necessary.—And again I may  
'find by reading the 11th of his Book a-  
'gainst Mr. *Russen*, that I have no Reason  
'to charge the *Anabaptists* in *England* with  
'the mad Pranks of some Enthusiastick Peo-  
'ple in *Germany*.

*Ad §. 14.* But I don't understand how  
Mr. St. has brought off the *Anabaptists* in  
*Germany* or these in *England*. He tells us  
indeed that those Broils arose from the  
Peoples Vindication of their civil Liberties,  
and that there was among them, superior  
in Number, a Multitude of Papists. But  
then with *Luther*, why does he not disa-  
vow the unlawful Practice of taking up  
Arms against their lawful Governours? That  
they tread in the Steps of the Romish Par-  
ty, is what we would have granted; and  
'tis to be doubted that Fear keeps them  
from re-acting the same Tragedies, not their  
sound Principles. Neither is it our Intent  
to excuse the *Pædobaptists* who have been  
guilty of the like Disturbances with those  
People, any more than it is to excuse the  
*Presbyterians* from what they did in the  
Times of our late unnatural Rebellion.



‘ And when he says the dutch Embaf-  
‘ fador fpoke in praife of the *Anabaptists*  
‘ to Monsieur *Turenne*, in that they were  
‘ commodious to the State, becaufe of their  
‘ not aspiring to Places of Dignity, and  
‘ that they fear’d no Rebellion from thofe  
‘ who make it an Article of their Faith  
‘ never to bear Arms; yet this was no Ar-  
‘ ticle of the German *Anabaptists* Faith, as  
is evident; nor, as I can perceive, is it one  
of ours in *England*; if it be, they as well  
as fome others of the like Profession, broke  
it in the late Wars not only in writing, but  
fighting againft the King: And there is good  
Reason indeed why the *Anabaptists* fhould  
not aspire to Places of Honour, becaufe  
the States have render’d them incapable  
of ’em; but we do not find the like here  
at Home. For tho’ their Humility be fo  
exceeding great, yet their Ambition is not  
fo very fmall, but that it will carry ’em  
to fue for the Dignity of Senatours; nor  
is their Confcience fo very fcrupulous, but  
they can difpence with the Ceremony of  
a long Robe in the State, tho’ not with  
that of a Surplice in the Church: When  
there is as much Popery in one, as in the  
other.

Mr. *St.* in the next Place makes up a  
whole Paragraph to fhew how I insulted  
Mr. *C.* by telling him, that he has no  
other

other Way to keep his ordinary Vocation in the Ministry from sinking, but by giving the Power of Ordination to the People. And says, 'he has already shown that 'there is no need for Mr. C. to bestow 'this Power upon the People, seeing there 'may be good and regular Ordination by 'the Hands of Ministers according to the 'divine Rule without the necessity of proving an uninterrupted Succession of Ordination from the Apostles.

*Ad* §. 15, 16. Now if he has any where in the Pages before, shown that there is no need for Mr. C. to bestow the Power of Ordination upon the People, my Eyesight must be extremely bad that I could not see it; if he has not, theirs must be very good that can find it. All that I apprehend him to have said upon this Point is in Page 6th where he expresses himself in these Words, 'I should think therefore 'those who are competently qualified for 'the Ministerial Office, and are regularly 'chosen by the People over whom they 'are to preside, and then ordain'd by the 'Imposition of the Hands of such Elders 'or Ministers as were allow'd to be invested with that Office before 'em, may be 'satisfied with their Call to the Ministry. But I think this is no Proof of the Matter, unless we allow bare Thoughts to be Demonstrations I 4 He

He says 'altho' the People can't ordain, 'yet they have a Right to choose Officers 'in the Church, as appears from *Acts* 6, '5. and 2 *Cor.* 18, 19.

But Mr. St. will find it utterly Impossible to prove from these Places, that the People have so much as a Right of electing Church Officers who minister in holy things, as these in the Text did, being *Διάκονοι λόγου*, as well as *Διάκονοι τραπεζῶν*, Deacons of the Word, as well as Deacons of Tables. The Apostles indeed commanded the People to look out seven Men of good Reputation; but for any one to argue from a bare Command, or Permission, to a perpetual Right, is such Logick as will not go down with the youngest Novice: At this rate, if my Governours command me to do a thing once, I may do it always; if they stand to my Dicision at one time, they are bound in Justice to stand to it for ever. So that if a Prince upon any emergent Occasions, requires Advice from a select Number of his Subjects, they may for the time to come take upon them to controul the Acts of Government, if they suit not with their own Humours, and claim a Share in the Legislature.

The other Text 2 *Cor.* 18. 19. is nothing to his purpose, for the Fellow-Traveller with the Apostle, was not chosen by the People



People, but by the Churches, *ἡ ἐκκλησία* *ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν συνέκδημεν ἡμῶν* \* who were the Bishops in Synod. And if we allow the People any thing to do in this Matter, it was by Grant and Permission, as Lay Persons have subscribed to Canons made by the Church, (*Consentientes subscripsimus*) and so was no proper Act of Authority.

If Mr. St. had thought of the *Cambridge* Edition when he was consulting, *Act. 6. 5.* he might perhaps have given the People Power of Ordination, because in our late times of Confusion they foisted in the second Person plural instead of the first, and when the Version ought to be, whom we may appoint, they render it, whom ye may appoint over this Business.

But seeing Mr. St. does not give the People Power to Ordain, he grants what we desire, *viz.* That those who are competently qualified for the Ministry, ought to be Ordain'd by those who have been invested with this Power before: And they are only Bishops; or if we give it to *Presbyters*, 'tis the same thing, for no Body allows them to be either, unless they derive their Authority from Apostolical Succession; for take away this, and we return immediatly into the State  
and

---

\* See Dr. Hammond upon these Texts, *viz.* *Act, 6, 5.*  
*2 Cor. 18. 19.*

and Condition of Lay-Persons, *viz.* Lay-Bishops, Lay-Presbyters, and Lay-Deacons, which are Synonymous Terms, with no Bishops, no Presbyters, no Deacons.

So that this Concession cuts off all pretences of the *Anabaptists* to an ordinary Vocation in the Ministry, proves them to be Lay Persons, and consequently, That they have no Authority to administer the Word and Sacraments. And thus I have done with Mr. St.'s Remarks upon this Head.

I come now in the second Place to consider of what Mr. St. writes, concerning Mr. C——'s extraordinary Vocation in the Ministry, where he begins, and tells us (when I accuse the *Anabaptists* with pretending to immediate Inspiration) 'That it does not follow, that because a Man who wants Human Learning, Preaches that therefore he pretends to immediate Inspiration.

*Ad §. 18.* But Mr. St. founds not his Argument upon the same Bottom as I do. For I grant it does not necessarily follow, that those who Preach, and are for the most part destitute of Human Learning, pretend to immediate Inspiration. But those who are altogether Ignorant, of that which is absolutely necessary to Qualify a Man for the Office of a Preacher, must pretend to come by their Knowledge after an extraordinary Manner,

Manner, seeing they can't have it in an Ordinary Way. And the very Instance which was brought to prove they of his Party hold with immediate Inspiration, Mr. St. passes by without the least Notice: And therefore I shall make bold again to insert it: 'Twas of a certain Person set up, and allow'd to Preach by the *Anabaptists* in *Agmondesham*, who was so despicably Ignorant, as that he never arrived to the Knowledge of an A B C Darian. And therefore if Mr. St. denies that they hold not immediate Inspiration, let him prove that this Person could preach, unless he was immediately inspir'd, seeing he was not able to read one Word or Syllable in the Scriptures; when at the same time he makes it necessary that those who preach and want Learning, 'ought to 'meditate upon the holy Scriptures, and 'make use of various Annotations, and o- 'ther Writings extant in the English 'Tongue to explain it. If he thinks this was an impudent Attempt in that Person who preach'd, being thus ignorant, and an Error in those who countenanc'd him in his bold Undertaking, why does he not observe and censure it as such? If he does not, why does he deny that they hold Immediate Inspiration? Is Mr. C's Congregation independent? Or is it infallible in its Decrees, as the Pope *in Cathedra*? Or is it an Exem-  
pation



ption, and so out of all Jurisdiction, unless that of a particular Patron's? Or lastly, have they no Canons to observe for the Regulation of their Actions in Church Affairs?

But the Case is so very plain, that no body can suspend their assent from believing they hold immediate Inspiration. For 'tis but going to their illiterate Teachers, and upbraid them for assuming to themselves the Priestly Office, in that every one is sensible of their being unfit for this sacred Employment, and they shall answer you, That Persons have done the like before them, who were as ignorant as themselves as to matters of Human Learning; and then they instance in the Apostles, who were, some of them, poor Tradesmen, and never had the Advantage of a Liberal Education. And therefore seeing they produce those Persons for their Patterns, who were immediately Inspired, who can suppose but that they maintain immediate Inspiration?

And tho' Mr. St. makes it requisite to consult Annotations and Commentaries upon Scripture, yet in this he opposes one of their great Apostles, viz. \* *Spittlehouse*, whose Words are these. 'What (saith this Anabaptistical Millennary) are the Authors  
' which

---

\* *Spittlehouse's Address.* p. 13.

‘ which their Libraries are stuffed withal,  
‘ other than Heathenish and Antichristian?  
‘ Again, Is there any Promise annex’d to  
‘ the Practice of reading them? Yea, doth  
‘ not Experience teach most, if not all such  
‘ Commentaries, Expositions, &c. which  
‘ have been composed by such Heathens and  
‘ Anti-christians, are found to be as light as  
‘ Vanity? Instance, the Voluminous Vo-  
‘ lumes of the Ancient Philosophers, and An-  
‘ cient Fathers (as they call them) yea, so  
‘ light, that they are of no Esteem at all a-  
‘ mongst the People of God that are come  
‘ out of *Babylon*.

So that belike, the Ancient Philosophers  
are to be rejected for writing Comments  
upon Scripture, (who liv’d before the time  
of Christ) as well as the Fathers, who were  
the glorious Lights of the Church of God,  
some Fellow-labourers with the Apostles,  
and by them planted in the Church, af-  
ter being their Disciples, as *Clemens at Rome*,  
*Ignatius at Antioch*; *St. Polycarp at Smyrna*,  
&c. many of whom, died Martyrs for the  
Christian Faith, and preserv’d the divine  
Oracles, which otherwise might have been  
utterly lost. But to have done with this, and  
a great deal of such horrid Stuff as might be  
cited from their own Authors, Mr. St. is  
as ill founded in what he says about the  
Clergy of the Church of *England* at the  
Be-

Beginning of the Reformation. For the Book of Homilies (he might as well say of Common-prayer, too) was not compiled out of a greater Respect to their Ignorance, than to the due Regulation of the Worship of God. For a Man may be a great Scholar, and yet entertain ill Principles. A bad Orator is no where so bad as in a Pulpit; this has been verified in those Bell-weatheres, who preach'd the People into the late Rebellion. And therefore let the *Anabaptists* compile a Book of Homilies as the Church did, in which are Sermons against the Peoples taking up Arms against their lawful Governours, and other good practical Discourses, and we will not esteem this so much a Mark of their Ignorance, as Discretion. For certainly their Ministers can't pretend to have more Learning now than ours had at the Beginning of the Reformation.

And when he says, 'I will not surely  
'censure those Ministers who were un-  
'learn'd then, or such as want Learning  
'now in the Church of *England*, as carry-  
'ing all that depend upon their Conduct  
'swiftly to the Abyss of Destruction; so  
there is not the least Reason for it; be-  
cause instructing the People out of the said  
Book of Homilies, and not being at Liber-  
ty to vent their own private, or interest'd  
Notions



Notions they were tied to the Delivery of wholesome and sound Doctrine : And as for those in our Times who want Learning sufficient for the Composition of elaborate Discourses, they are advis'd to have recourse to other learned Works (of which great Numbers are extant) rather than trust their own Weakness: Altho' Mr. St. will find very few that need such Helps; especially in comparison of the *Anabaptists*.

But these People are so far from proceeding in this warraptable Method, that they express an utter abhorrence of it. Every one steps from his Shop or Employment up into the Pulpit, and tho' they know not perhaps how to make a right Use of those Instruments belonging to their Profession, yet they will venture to wield the Sword of the Spirit, when according to human probability, they must of Necessity destroy more, than they can defend, or secure. For 'tis ill playing with Edge-Tools, but whereas those can at most but affect the Body, yet by Male-administration of the Spiritual Weapon, not only the Body but Soul is endanger'd also. To make use of written premeditated Discourses and set Forms of Prayer, is with them the same thing as to quench the Motions of the Spirit, and stop the powerful Current of their Oratory ; and thus when they can scarce give a rational

Answer

Answer to Man, they will presume to address God himself, and request his divine Assistance in such Words and Phrases, as serve rather to call down his Vengeance.

*Ad* §. 19. In the next Place he says, 'That I would certainly be thought to know the Teachers of the *Anabaptists* very well, else how cou'd I take so exact a Measure of their Knowledge as to tell that most of 'em are ignorant of their Primers. Perhaps I know more of 'em than he is aware of; and if I grant thus much, I'm afraid, it will be too large a Concession. I have but just now given an Instance of one who was so far from understanding his Primer, that he never learn'd his Hornbook; and 'tis easie to guess from hence the Proportion of their Learning, when they make Choice of such Illiterate Persons to Preach.

But the Primer is a Book made up with the Litany, and other excellent Collects taken out of the Common-Service-Book of the Church of *England*, which they reject as things Antichristian, and contrary to the Word of God; when at the same time they are not only warranted by the Practice of the \* Primitive Church in all Ages, but also

---

\* In the first Age, *Victorius Sciacicus Maronita*, in his Preface to his Liturgies says, *Latini & Græci pontifices multa*

also by the Example of the † Jewish Church in the substantial Part of their Worship, and the Practice of our † Saviour and his Apostles, so that I may truly affirm they are ignorant of their Primer, first, in respect of the Sense of it; and in the second Place, were many of 'em put to the reading of it, they would by their Hesitancy and Uncouth Manner of Pronunciation make it plainly appear, that they ought rather to

K

be

ta deinceps in suis Liturgiis quas jam inde ab Apostolis acceperunt pro re nata vel immutarunt vel addiderunt. Hegesippus almost bordering upon the Apostles times saith, that St. James was call'd Jacobus Liturgus in regard of a Form of Service compil'd by him for the Use of the Church of Jerusalem. In the second Age we meet with Κοινὰ εὐχαὶ in Just. Mart. second Apology to Antonius the Emperour, as distinguished from those Prayers offer'd up by the πρεσβυς, or chief Minister, which he used by Way of Preface to his Homily. In the third Age we meet with εὐχὰς πρεσβυτέρων, prescrib'd Prayers, Orig. 1. 6. cont. Cels. In the fourth Age Eusebius writes, That Constantine the Great commanded all his Subjects to celebrate the Lord's Day with elaborate and studied Forms of Prayer, Hist. Eccles. l. 4. c. 19. In this same Age the famous Council of Laodicea hath left Canons, That the same Service should be used Morning and Evening. Can. 18. The Milevitan Council provideth against the Practice of extempore Prayers. Con. Mil. 2. 12. Placuit ut preces vel orationes quæ probatæ fuerint in conciliis ab omnibus celebrentur, &c. At the Beginning of the next Age, Basil, Ambrose, and St. Chrysostom fram'd Liturgies. In the sixth Age Gregory the Great and St. Isidore put forth Forms of divine Service. Calvin himself made use of a set Prayer which is prefixt to his Lectur. upon Ezek. and Dan.

† 1 Chron. 25. 6, 7. 2 Chron 29. 30. Numb. 10. 35, 36. Psalm. 73, 74, 75, &c.

‡ Luk. 15. 18, 19. Matt. 26. 39. Rom. 16. 24. 2 Cor. 13. 14. Ephes. 6. 24. 2 Thess. 3. 18. Heb. 13. 25, &c.



be taught themselves, in the first Rudiments of human Literature, than take upon 'em to instruct others in the Doctrines of Christianity.

*Ad §. 20.* He allows in the next Place, ' That the *Anabaptists* ought to give that ' Proof which I mention of their Mission, ' if it be extraordinary, but says its a bold ' Assertion of mine, to affirm that they pretend to this extraordinary Mission. But let him cut and shuffle as long as he will, he can't avoid the Force of the Argument which I have just now brought against them. For this was not only the Pretence of the German *Anabaptists*, but most among them in the Time of our late Wars, pretended to immediate Inspiration, and for a small Taste of their Illumination, take *John Canne* in his Voice from the Temple to the higher Powers; printed in the Year 1653.

' This Year, saith he, (*viz.* 1648) do I affirm with Assurance, was the Time when ' the Thrones were set, and the ancient did ' sit; as is express'd in *Dan.* 7. 9, 10. Here ' began the Lord God Almighty, to call ' Kings and Kingdoms to an Account, to ' cast down the Mighty from their Seats, ' to cut off the Spirit of Princes, and to be ' terrible unto the Kings of the Earth. And ' this Work goes forward still, and shall ' prevail and prosper to the utter breaking ' and

‘and destroying of the Fourth Monarchy  
‘or Roman Empire, &c.

‘Then in Pag. 19. speaking of the lit-  
‘tle Horn, he would have two things ob-  
‘serv’d, 1<sup>st</sup> The little Horn is to be con-  
‘sider’d as the Kingdom of the Beast and  
‘as the Members or Worshipers of the  
‘Beast ; by the Kingdom of the Beast, I  
‘understand him as changing Times and  
‘Laws; by the Members, as making War  
‘against the Saints. 2<sup>d</sup>. When I speak of  
‘the little Horn, or Antichrist, I do not  
‘mean the Person of the Pope, or any Suc-  
‘cession that Way, but I mean a State or  
‘Kingdom. It is true, the Pope is a Mem-  
‘ber of that Body, but he is not the Bo-  
‘dy (wonderful nice indeed!) Again, I do  
‘not here intend alone, the Church, Mi-  
‘nistry, Worship or Government of *Rome* ;  
‘but I include all false Churches [such was  
‘his own] Ministries, Forms, Ordinances,  
‘Institutions, brought in by Men, &c.

Now to parallel his Impudence, and Blas-  
phemy, ‘Have not, saith *Spittlehouse*, the  
‘People of God in this Nation, the same  
‘Immediate Teachings of the Spirit, as had  
‘the Prophets and Apostles of Jesus Christ?  
‘Are the Scriptures of the old Testament  
‘any other than the Dictates of the Spirit  
‘of God? 2 *Pet.* 1. 19, 20, 21. Are they  
‘not the same in Print, as they were in

‘the Apostles Writings; and the same in  
 ‘their Writings as they were in their Words;  
 ‘and the same in their Words, as they were  
 ‘in their Thoughts; and the same in their  
 ‘Thoughts, as they were in their Concep-  
 ‘tions; and the same in their Conceptions,  
 ‘as in the Infusion; and the same in the  
 ‘Infusion, as they were in their Infuser,  
 ‘viz. the Holy Ghost? &c. *Spittlehouse*, first  
 ‘addresses, P. 11.

Again, ‘*Samuel Oat* an *Anabaptist* (no  
 ‘less blasphemous) after he had baptiz’d a  
 ‘Woman, bid her gape, and she gap’d;  
 ‘and he did blow three times into her  
 ‘Mouth, saying Words to this purpose, ei-  
 ‘ther receive the Holy Ghost, or now thou  
 ‘hast receiv’d the Holy Ghost: *Gangrana*,  
 ‘Part 2. P. 147.

Here I might enumerate the rest of that  
 Abominable Gang, such as *Sedgwick*, *Freak*,  
 and *John James*, &c. But these are suffi-  
 cient to show how directly our English *A-*  
*nabaptists* have trod the Serpentine Paths  
 of *Munster* and *John of Leyden*, notwith-  
 standing all their Pretences to the contrary.  
 And therefore if the present ones of our  
 Time, expect to have the good Opinion of  
 understanding Persons, let them not only  
 draw up a few equivocating Confessions of  
 their Faith and Doctrine, but remonstrate  
 against such abominable and blasphemous  
 Trans-



Transactions. Let them condemn their Predecessors villainy, and write against their Extravagant Novelties, and newfangled Doctrines: Let 'em not only say when they are charg'd with the same Crimes, that they maintain them not; but let 'em Discover, that what those People did, was horrid, blasphemous, antiscriptural, and rebellious, by writing particularly against their Tenets and Actions. If they do not this, let them not blame us, but themselves, as the Occasion why we entertain no better Opinion of their Principles.

For should such blasphemous Books be written by Men who profess themselves Members of the Church of *England*, and receive no Answer, or at least escape all publick Censures from her own Members, future Ages would accuse them, as we do the *Anabaptists*, for maintaining the same Doctrines, and their Confessions would be look'd upon only as a Cover for their Underhand Principles. What he says of Mr. *Mason* of *Northamptonshire* is not to the purpose, because this Gentleman was deprived of the Use of Reason; but I presume he will not allow thus much concerning those *Anabaptists* I have just mention'd.

*Ad §. 21.* But I am not only a false Accuser of the Brethren, but a Man of a persecuting Spirit, because I affirm'd, That the

Predecessors of the *Anabaptists* ought to have suffer'd Death. And Mr. *St.* is sensible that this is the only Chief Argument that can be used to prejudice People against the Truth.

For produce never so good Reasons against the Principles and Practice of the Dissenters, 'tis but crying out upon Persecution, and then the People being frighted and alarm'd with this Scare-crow, shelter themselves under the Cry of Moderation, and stand buff against the plainest Demonstrations produc'd by any Man, that is branded with the odious Name of a Persecutor; altho' he had no other Intent but to discover and admonish them of their Errours, and was an Enemy alone to their Vices, without Entertaining the least Thoughts of doing harm to their Persons.

But Mr. *St.* is not aware, that when he blames me for this Passage against the *Anabaptists*, that he arraigns the Spirit of God for Cruelty, altho' he seems to take most Delight in the Attribute of Mercy. For it is His plain revealed Will, that false Prophets should be taken from among Men: For which I produce this Proof, *viz.* \* *The Prophet which shall presume to speak a Word in my Name, which I have not commanded him*  
to

---

\* Deut. 18. 20, 21, 22.

*Mr. Stennett's Remarks, &c. III*

*to speak, or that shall speak in the Name of other Gods, even that prophet shall die. And if thou say in thine Heart, How shall we know the Word which the Lord hath not spoken? When a Prophet speaketh in the Name of the Lord, if the thing follow not nor come to pass, that is the Thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but the Prophet hath spoken it presumptuously: Thou shalt not be afraid of him.*

And therefore seeing the *Anabaptists* plainly made it appear, that they were false Prophets in their Predictions about the *Millennium*, as well as by asserting their own spiritual Infatuations to be the Word of God, let him not set me down for a false Accuser, and Persecutor, because they have by their Actions deserv'd capital Punishment. For by the same Reason he may call the Ministers of Justice, Persecutors, when they pass Sentence of Death according to Law, upon those who have been guilty of Felony and Murther; seeing Blasphemy against God, is at least, a Crime of as deep a dye, as those are against Men.

*Ad §. 22.* I did not bring *John of Leyden* and his Colleagues upon the Stage, as if they were the only Persons who have committed such filthy and abominable Crimes, as Adultery, and Polygamy; but to show, they could not be immediately Inspired because of their Immoral Practices. And I



believe it will be difficult for Mr. St. to give an Instance of any Number of Men among the *Pedobaptists*, who have been guilty of such Bestialities, and then father them upon the Holy Spirit of God, as these miscreant *Anabaptists* did. I am glad to hear they disclaim these things, as wicked and unjust. But what else can they do, when they can't justify them? I doubt not but if we were to examine all the Sectaries that are amongst us, we should find none that would publicly own that odious Principle, which has been so justly fix'd upon some of them, as, “\* That Marriage is most just, which  
 ‘ is made without any ambitious End, and  
 ‘ if this liking and mutual Corresponden-  
 ‘ cy happen between the nearest Kindred;  
 ‘ then it is also the most Natural, the most  
 ‘ Lawful, and according to the Primitive  
 ‘ Purity and Practice.

But to rake no farther into a Pit of Mud and Filthiness, Mr. St. says next, ‘ That  
 ‘ left the Charge of false Prophecy and  
 ‘ Blasphemy should not render the *Ana-  
 ‘ baptists* infamous enough, and make some  
 ‘ of 'em at least thought worthy of Ca-  
 ‘ pital Punishment, M. B. is pleas'd to charge  
 ‘ them with Treason: In that I affirm their  
 Preach-

---

\* *Little None-such*, Lond. 1646. p. 13. cited by the Lond. Min. Decl. p. 19.

‘preaching up Doctrine contrary to the Word  
‘of God, as the Disobedience to, and Extir-  
‘pation of Kings.

*Ad §. 23.* Now if I affirm this, do I accuse them with what they have not been guilty of? He who consults the Works of those impious Saints, I before mention'd, will find they have been notorious Offenders in this Point; and therefore they may pretend to be as good Subjects as they will, their Actions make the contrary appear. If they are Friends to the Government, let them act as Friends of the Government should do. Their Apologies published to vindicate themselves upon this Account, are to be look'd upon no otherwise than as things to lull a careless World into Security, and to impose upon ignorant and credulous People. For they are not enjoyn'd to be observ'd in all their Conventicles, under Pain of forfeiting their Privileges and Preferments, if any of their Ministers teach contrary Doctrine; they are but the Works of a few, perhaps 50, or 60, and so cannot be esteem'd as the Sentiments of the ruling part of that Body. If ever (as God forbid) they should, and 'tis unlikely they ever will, get the Power into their Hands, they may make the same Excuse to justify their Disloyalty, as they do now to shift off Accusations about their Heterodox Opinions; for 'tis

'tis but saying in Reference to their former Confessions, that they were but the Scheme and Work of 50 or 60 particular Persons, and that affects our whole Body, no more than the Opinion of such a Number of People does that of the Church of *England*.

But I have a Home Question, or two, to ask them. Do they think the Murther of our late blessed Sovereign King *Charles I.* was a Sin? Or do they not? If they affirm it was, why then do they not with the Church of *England*, observe, and set apart the publick Time of Fasting and Humiliation in order to avert the Judgment of God from falling upon the Nation? A publick notorious Crime, calls for a publick Acknowledgment, and publick deprecation of Vengeance. Why then do they Brand that Royal Martyr with the odious Names of Tyrant, Oppressor, Papist, and seem by their Actions to wish for an Opportunity of reacting the same Villainies? If publick Days of Humiliation, and Fasting are necessary to be set apart for the imploring God's Assistance against our Enemies Abroad; why do they not strictly observe that which is set apart for the imploring God's Mercy, and Forgiveness of our National Transgressions at Home; which are our greatest Enemies? But if they believe that execrable Fact to be no Sin, why then



*Mr. Stennett's Remarks, &c.* 115

then do they mince the Matter, and by a few plausible Flourishes pretend Friendship to that Government, against which they know themselves to be secret Enemies? If the principal Governours among them be able, and are empower'd to injoin publick Days of Humiliation, why do they not command this Day to be observ'd with due Severity; that so they may demonstrate the Truth of their pretended Principles, by their real Actions? If they be not, why then do they say they are generally Friends to Monarchical Government?

*Ad* §. 24. But now Mr. St. begins to fall foul upon the Nonjurers, not I presume, because they are at present irreconciled to the Government; but because many of 'em expose the Dissenting Cause by their learn'd Writings.

But I think it not my Business to vindicate the Nonjurers in their Proceedings, which do not in the least affect the Constitution of the Church of *England*; and therefore I shall leave 'em to answer for themselves. Tho' at the same time, so far as I can conceive, these Men strictly assert Obedience to Kings, tho' they are mistaken as to the Person to whom they ought to direct their Obedience. This has frequently been the Case of many good Men, who when the Rights of Princes were disputed,  
have

have adhered to the wrong Side. But the *Anabaptists*, have not only publish'd Doctrines pernicious to Monarchy, but have had Impudence enough, as well as Villiany, to assault the very Person of their acknowledg'd King, whose Title to the Crown was never question'd.

And therefore, as Mr. St. says, if we may judge of Mens Principles, by their Practices, we shall find, that of the two, the *Anabaptists* have been the greatest Enemies of our Government, because they have not only made large Purse-Contributions, but used all their Might, in Order to \* De-throne their lawful Monarch.

When he says next, that in the mean while perhaps (which was well put in) 'I can find no disaffected or (disloyal Person among the *Anabaptists*, he seems not to have a right Notion of Disloyalty. For I take him to be a disloyal Person, who entertains disloyal Principles; he is one in Habit, tho' not in Act. And at this Rate I'm afraid most of his Party must be yoak'd under this Denomination. For their chief Discourse at the Places of publick News, is

---

\* At the Rendezvous of the Kings Army at Wellington nigh Shrewsbury, his Majesty declares in his Protestation to his Forces, that his Enemies were most of them Brownists, Anabaptists and Atheists. Clar. Hist. vol. 2 Part. 1 lib. 6. pa. 17. 8vo.

is altogether tending to extol and magnifie the Power of the People, as those from whence all Crown'd-Heads derive their Authority; which is a Principle as far distant from true Loyalty, as human things are in their Natures from those that are divine.

And therefore Mr. St. ought not to number my Accusation among the Works of Darkness, when I assert, That his Partizans entertain levelling Principles, for these flow as naturally from placing the Power in the People, as Streams issue from their proper Fountains.

And when I say afterwards, That they are 'guilty of Railings, Back-bitings, and evil Surmises, and speak evil of the things they understand not, it is apparently true. For do they not daily surmise strange things of the Church of *England*? Do they not rail and back-bite, when they accuse her Ministers of Popery, and her innocent Ceremonies of Superstition? And is it not evident that they understand nothing of these things, when their Assertions are as contrary to Truth, as Fire is to Water.

But as I concluded my Letter to Mr. C. in recommending him and other *Anabaptists* to the Consideration of what St. Jude saith, ver. 11th. *Wo unto them, for they have gone in the way of Cain, and ran greedily after the Errour of Balaam for reward,*



ward, and perish'd in the Gainsaying of Korah, So Mr. St. wishes I had explained my Meaning, for says he, Do the *Anabaptists* go in the way of *Cain*, by Envyng and Persecuting their Brethren, because more Righteous than themselves? I do not say they do at present, because 'tis out of their Power, but like *Cain* have they not? Hath not *Spittlehouse* in his Address to *Oliver Cromwell* said, *That which the Lord expects from you, at this your Convention, is, That you would make his Foes his Footstool; which certain I am, can be no otherwise effected, than by plucking up all those Plants which the Heavenly Father hath not Planted;— which I do affirm to be the Priests and Lawyers of this Nation, viz. all such Priests (under what Name or Title soever Dignified or Distinguish'd) as shall be found in Babylon, viz. All such as have not disclaim'd their Rantism, and Ordination, which they have received from the Popes of Rome and their Successors. Have they not Preach'd against, Envied, and Persecuted the poor Orthodox Clergy of the Church of England, in the late Rebellion, who were more Righteous than themselves? Do they not run after the Errour of Balaam for reward, tho' not in Tempting Men to \* Idolatry, yet from the one true Church to Superstition and Schism? Do they*

---

\* *Omne Simile non est idem.*

they not Presumptuously oppose Divine Revelation, like those that perish'd in the Gainfaying of *Korah*, by assuming to themselves the Administration of the Word and Sacraments, without the least Warrant, or Authority, when it is plainly said, \* *That no Man taketh this Honour unto himself, but he that is called of God as was Aaron?* All this is as plain as the Sun in his Meridian, and therefore is so far (as he would have it) from calling for my Consideration and Repentance, that it highly calls for his own.

*Ad §. 25.* Thus I have done with Mr St——'s Remarks upon my Letter sent to Mr. C. and have (I hope) plainly shew'd that what he has said in Defence of the *Anabaptists* Ministry is not at all availing to his Cause, but is for the most Part mere Flourish and Quibble: And therefore, as he has promised to offer his Prayers to Almighty God, to make me sensible of my Errors, so I promise to do the like in behalf of him, for Equivocation is not by any Means allowable in temporal Concerns, much less in those which are eternal.

---

\* Heb. 5. 4.

*Thus I make bold to subscribe my self  
His very humble Servant*

JO. BAILL.

they are Presumptuously oppose Divine  
Revelation, like those that perished in the  
Galaad of Kail, by allowing to them-  
selves the Administration of the Word  
and Sacraments, without the least Warrant  
or Authority, which is plainly said, \*  
That no Man taketh this Honour unto him-  
self, but he that is called of God: as was  
Aaron? all this is plain as the Sun in his  
Midst, and therefore is to far (as he would  
have us) from calling for my Considera-  
tion and Regardance, that it highly calls for  
his own.

Mr. Stennett. Thus I have done with Mr.  
Stennett's Remarks upon my Letter sent to  
Mr. C. and Mr. D. plainly shew'd  
that what he has said in Defence of the  
Presbyterian Ministry is not at all availing  
to his Cause, but for the most Part more  
Flourish and Gobble. And therefore as  
he is permitted to offer his Traverses to Al-  
mighty God, to make me sensible of my  
Errors, so I promise to do the like in be-  
half of him, for I am convinced is not by any  
Means allowable in temporal Controversies  
much less in those which are eternal.

6 AT 58